

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

1906



THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 17. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, JANUARY, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Readers who can endorse the foregoing in its entirety are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the nearest Branch or with the General Secretary. See Directory, page 8.

The Essentials of Socialist Unity.

TO THE SOCIALIST WORKING-CLASS.

COMRADES,

In the January number of our official organ—THE SOCIALIST STANDARD—we addressed you concerning the International Socialist Congresses, and briefly dwelt with our reasons for declining an invitation from the Secretary of the British section at the Amsterdam Congress to take part in forming a National Committee to deal with matters arising out of the International Congress, on the grounds that it should be the task of the Socialist Party alone to deal with these questions, and that, judging by the composition of the British section at the Amsterdam Congress, the proposed Committee would consist of men who are in no sense of the word Socialists. That Committee has now been formed and its composition fully justifies the view we took of it in January last.

In accordance with our promise, we have forwarded a communication to the International Socialist Bureau, asking that, in our name, a motion be placed upon the Agenda of the next International Congress, for discussion in open Congress, embodying the following proposals:—

(a) That admission to future International Socialist Congresses shall be open only to all avowed Socialist bodies that accept the essential principles of Socialism, i.e., socialisation of the means of production and distribution, union and international action of workers, Socialist conquest of the Public Powers by the proletariat organised as a class party recognising and proclaiming the class war, running all candidates upon this basis and adopting an attitude of hostility under all circumstances to all sections of the capitalist party.

(b) That all previous resolutions (defining the basis of admission to the Congress) be rescinded.

(c) That all matters upon the agenda be discussed in open Congress and that the methods

of discussion in Commissions be entirely abolished.

(d) That each delegate shall have one vote, but if a poll be demanded, each Party represented shall be entitled to one vote.

(e) That representation upon the Bureau shall be upon the basis of Parties represented at the Congress, each of which shall be entitled to one representative upon the Bureau.

We have further requested the Bureau to at once consider the advisability of adopting one language in which all the business of the Bureau and of the Congress shall be conducted, with the object of coming to a decision upon the matter in sufficient time for the language decided upon to be adopted as the official language of the Stuttgart Congress.

Up to now the International Socialist Congresses have not considered the composition of the Nationalities represented thereat. At Amsterdam, National matters were entered into, when a resolution was passed in favour of National Unity. If the International Movement is to be placed upon a sound revolutionary basis the Congress must enter into the character of the different National organisations which are obtaining admission to the Congresses and affiliation to the Bureau. When the Congress has, by its resolute action, eliminated all pseudo-socialist organisations, such as deny the existence of the class war, or in any way support the capitalist class or its catpaws in their respective countries, then unity of the Socialist forces in each country will be easily accomplished.

We are, Comrades,

With fraternal greetings,

The Executive Committee,
Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Head Office,

1a, Caledonian Road,

London,

December, 1905.

The Impending Collapse of Labourism.

With the near approach of a general election the signs and portents that tell of the futility of what is at present known as the "Independent Labour Representation" movement increase and multiply. With one desire paramount in their minds—the desire to secure election many of the candidates for whom the Labour Representation Committee is responsible, are quite ready to subordinate their independence to their election in the belief, quite honestly held doubtless in some cases, that some special virtue attaches to the right to append the letters M.P. after a name. Nor is this surprising. When men set out with the all-pervading notion that the imperative necessity of the hour is the formation of a "Labour Group" inside the House of Commons, without a very clear notion as to why there should be such a group, without being at infinite pains to understand the reasons underlying the supposed necessity, without being intimately acquainted with the only conditions upon which a Labour Group can be of utility

and effect, it is not surprising if they think to proceed to their "independence" within the Commons, by very dependent methods without. It is not surprising that Mr. Richards, the L.R.C. candidate for Wolverhampton, for example, prefers not to take the chances of defeat in opposition to the Liberals when the chances of election in alliance with them are so bright. And this it would seem, on the authority of Mr. Tom Jones, representing the "Labour" side of the Liberal-Labour Conference held to make arrangements, is the position of the responsible officers of the Labour Representation Committee. "They were satisfied that, anxious as they were to get a Labour Representative returned, it was impossible to do so on Labour lines exclusively. . . . The one object . . . which the Labour Party had was to try and replace one of the worst governments of modern times. . . . they regretted that some annoyance had been caused by individual men objecting to Liberals having anything to do with them," and so on.

PARTY NOTES.

THE Executive Committee have dissolved all Sub-Committees and will in future meet at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m.

It has also been decided to abolish all Special Funds or rather to consolidate them into one General Fund.

This does not mean that the Party can do without the money hitherto raised by means of these special funds. On the contrary it can do with very much more, so that its sphere of activity may be considerably widened.

At the same time, it must be clearly understood that a member is only required by rule to pay twopence per week to the Party. But there are some who can afford more and these need only to be reminded that cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to A. J. M. Gray.

The Delegate Meeting will be held at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street on Saturday, the 27th inst. at 3 p.m., and a Party Reunion will take place at the same Club on Friday, the 26th inst.

Members should apply to their Branch Secretary for their new cards without delay.

Although the E.C. will not in future meet on Saturdays, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD will still be published on the first Saturday in each month and the Head Office will be kept open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Branches so desiring can have their supplies of the Party Organ sent by carrier direct from the printers on the Friday preceding date of publication.

Comrade R. A. V. Morris has resigned his membership of the S.D.F. and the Secretaryship of both the Bexley and District Socialist Society and the Dartford Division Joint Unemployed Committee in order to become a member of our Party. He is endeavouring to form a Branch and will be glad to hear from readers in the district. His address is "Oxshott," Warren Road, Bexley Heath.

Comrade Rogers of Southend is very actively engaged in exposing the contradictory tactics of the local confusionists. On December 15th, after one Thomas Doody had spoken for the S.D.F., our comrade asked a number of questions bearing upon the difference between the preaching and the practice of that body, and why prominent members of the S.D.F. supported the defenders of capitalism. Mr. Doody, unable to satisfactorily reply, relied upon the usual side-tracking dodge, and thundered forth charges against this Party and its members. Now, if all Mr. Doody's charges could be substantiated, if all his statements concerning us were true, the soundness or otherwise of the tactics of the S.D.F. would not be affected in the least. And when a public speaker, professing to have an open platform, to invite and to welcome criticism and opposition, ignores the criticism, shirks the questions, and makes wild charges against persons who are not there to speak for themselves, the public can easily see that his case must be a very bad one indeed.

Friend Doody declared that the members of the S.P.G.B., "instead of staying in the S.D.F. and trying to pull it straight, left and formed a new party." We thank Mr. Doody for the public admission that the S.D.F. is crooked and requires to be pulled straight. He is apparently unaware that most of those who came out and formed the new party in June, 1901 had been for years trying to pull the S.D.F. straight and that they only came out when they recognised that "Vested Interests" were too strong for them; in other words, that the extent to which the Twentieth Century Press Ltd., the proprietors

of "Justice," the official organ of the S.D.F., was dependent upon Trade Union officials for orders and capital and upon individual capitalist politicians for financial assistance rendered it impossible for the S.D.F. to go straight.

If Mr. Doody will refer to the letter sent to the S.D.F. Executive in June, 1901, signed by some of the oldest and best known members of the S.D.F., asking for permission to form a Central West Ham branch, because those who signed it refused to associate themselves with the compromising policy then being pursued by the branches and members in West Ham, he will be compelled to admit that even at that time efforts were being made to "pull the S.D.F. straight."

The S.D.F. Executive, well knowing the extent to which the movement had been compromised in West Ham, gave permission for the branch to be formed.

That those who signed the letter had accurately judged the position is testified by a long communication from J. J. Terrett, who was a member of the S.D.F., which appeared in the "South Essex Mail" for December 16th last. He says:

"Most Socialists and Trade Unionists will, as they are pleased to phrase it, 'vote for the least of two evils,' viz., the Liberal as something better than the Tory. This has been our consistent attitude for nine years in all contexts at Stratford, municipal, poor law, or national."

The italics are ours.

We did our best, then, to pull the S.D.F. straight, but without success. On April 23rd, 1904, a meeting of London members of the S.D.F. was held at Shoreditch Town Hall to discuss the resolutions passed at the Easter Conference. At that meeting Mr. J. F. Green, a comparatively new member of the S.D.F., who, because he was a middle-class man and acquainted with large numbers of middle-class reformers, was made a member of the S.D.F. Executive and appointed to the Treasurership almost immediately he joined the body, told us if we could not agree with the policy of the S.D.F. we ought to clear out. We cleared out.

Yes, we of the working-class, who had stood up at the street corner in defence of the revolutionary principles which the S.D.F. once promulgated, at a time when it was dangerous, physically and socially, to do so, we who had performed, in the interest of the working-class to which we belong, our full share of the hard graft which fell, and will continue to fall, to the lot of the revolutionist, were told to clear out by a middle-class man, pushed to the head of an alleged working-class organisation, if we did not agree with what he and his middle-class confederates considered was the proper policy to be pursued.

In June, 1901, we formed The Socialist Party of Great Britain. If you desire to follow the record of our work, send a postal order for 3s. to our Head Office, and you will receive post free a bound copy of volume I of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Amongst other wild statements, Mr. Doody declared that Comrade Lehane was the editor of this journal. What that had to do with the policy of the S.D.F. cannot be seen. But the statement is not true. Lehane has never edited the paper.

Mr. Doody also made certain statements concerning J. Fitzgerald, but as he also offered to meet our comrade in public debate and his challenge was immediately accepted on our behalf by Comrade Rogers, these need not be dealt with here. Arrangements will be made for the debate as soon as possible, and will be duly announced.

Ask your Branch Secretary for the Party Emblem. Twopence, or post free from Head Office for three stamps.

A LOOK ROUND.

A COMRADE sends me what he describes as a "Problem for Socialists." At an Eastern seaside town, much frequented during July, August, and September by holiday makers, there was a small piece of land near the sea, of no value, too sandy for cultivation and too shifty for house building. It was let to a few fishermen for three or four shillings a year to dry their nets upon.

One Spring, however, two men went to the landlord and offered to hire the land during the summer months at a rental of £1 per month, to which the landlord willingly consented. The hirers fenced the land, erected a booth and dressing-room, obtained two or three hundred chairs, and announced that, weather permitting, concerts would be given twice a day during the season. The troupe, consisting of three women and four men, soon arrived. They were successful and at the end of the season were at least £100 to the good.

In the following Spring they again went to the landlord and proposed to hire the land as before. But the "ramrod man" would not agree unless the hirers would pay £16 per month. And in that manner, without any effort on his part, the landlord was enabled to take to himself all the profit that the musical troupe, by their work, ability and persistency, could make.

"What a shameful affair. How unjust." And my correspondent adds that the landlord was the Town Council! He asks whether this fact made the transaction any juster, and what would occur under Socialism in similar circumstances.

Now, excepting to those persons who imagine that a municipality under capitalism is anything but a capitalist body, trading on capitalist lines with the object of making a profit out of their enterprises for the benefit of the property owners, the action of the particular municipality will evoke no surprise or condemnation. Is it not urged by land "reformers" that Public Bodies should secure and retain possession of land in order that they may obtain the "unearned increment," which now goes to the individual landlord?

As to what would happen in similar circumstances under Socialism, my correspondent will agree, upon reflection, that there could be no similar circumstances. Under Socialism the people will not only produce, by their own highly organised collective effort, the material wealth necessary to existence, but will also, by associated effort, provide their own amusements and pastimes, where desirable. You would not have, in the Socialist State, some folks providing amusement for others, as a speculation, depending for their sustenance upon individual contributions from pleased or pitying members of the community.

Of course, no Socialist, unless he is a very raw recruit, wastes his time putting forward any cut-and-dried scheme which he claims will be the method of detailed organisation in the Socialist State. He knows that when the necessary mental revolution which must precede the economic revolution has been accomplished, the people will be more capable of settling the details of the new society than anyone now living. The Socialist can only advocate the principles upon which he believes Society should be based and upon which he believes it *will* be based. Because, unless that which he thinks should happen is likely to happen, he is simply wasting himself. He claims that Socialism is scientific because he has carefully studied the history of pre-capitalist states of society and watched the developments and tendencies of the present. He can show that the tendency is towards the most economical and effective organisation of the production of wealth. But to-day this organisation is in the hands of a class, comprising the individual capitalist, the trust and the capital-

ist municipality, all making up the capitalist state. The interests considered are capitalist interests and the function of the Socialist is to convince the people of the advantages of this organisation being controlled by and in the interests of the wealth producers. When this is accomplished the people will establish the Socialist Republic.

It sometimes happens that municipal enterprise is uneconomical and reactionary as compared with the enterprise of the Trust and Combine and it is just a question as to whether Socialists should not oppose this form of capitalist development.

Rent is robbery. It matters not to me whether I am robbed by the dual landlord or the municipal landlord and the extent to which municipalities claim to be enabled to reduce the rates by trading is no concern of the working-class. Rents are not reduced because rates go down. In fact, the opening up of a tramway route, by which the municipality may be enabled to reduce rates by a halfpenny or so, often causes rents to rise, by rendering more accessible districts where hitherto competition for house accommodation, which determines rents, was exceedingly restricted. Moreover, trams, tubes, etc., which are being provided everywhere, even for school children, are producing a race that cannot walk—a "born-tired" people.

If all those who have at some time or another emphasised the fact that the working-class are not affected by rates would always adhere to that position there would be less confusion of thought amongst the working-class. Here, for instance, is Mr. Will Thorne, the L.R.C. candidate for South West Ham, who has declared that it would make no difference to the working-class if the rates in West Ham were twenty shillings in the £, putting on the front page of his election address: "Nationalisation of Education, Poor Rates, Mine Rents, and Mineral Royalties." Mr. Thorne does not explain how these matters concern the poverty-stricken workers of South West Ham. In the body of his address he says he is strongly in favour of "Nationalisation of the Land, Canals, Railways, Mine Rents, and Mineral Royalties, the private ownership of which acts as the real barrier to British Industry in the Markets of the World!"

This is an interesting pronouncement for a man whom the S.D.F. claim as their candidate, although he is nothing of the sort and they are not responsible for one penny of his election expenses. As a matter of fact, admitted by the capitalist Press, British Industry has been supplanted because production naturally tends to locate itself where natural conditions are most favorable. But why concern ourselves about Britain's position in the markets of the world? For the capitalists, whether Free Traders or Tariff Reformers, the matter is of interest, but the concern of the Socialist is to stop the exploitation of the working-class, not to help one set of capitalists to exploit at the expense of another.

That is a capitalist struggle, like the fiscal fight. One set of capitalists say that we (i.e., British Capitalists) are losing because our fiscal system requires changing; another set say that we hold our position because of our fiscal system and shall lose it if we change. And so their struggle continues. It is a matter of indifference to me whether I am plucked by a Free Trade Kite or a Protectionist Crow; I object to the plucking.

I am glad that some of Mr. Thorne's friends recognise this. In last week's "Justice" Mr. D. Carmichael writes:

"Members should insist, during the coming election, on making the workers realise that, while the fiscal question may be of interest to their masters, it is of little importance to them, and by heckling the capitalist candidates on every possible occasion expose the folly of depending on the robber class helping the robbed."

Mr. D. Carmichael is one of the unemployed "leaders" who have been "demanding" that the robber class shall help the robbed!

But Mr. Will Thorne does not agree with Mr. Carmichael. He declares for "No Tariff Barriers" and is a "determined opponent of the imposition of any Tariff burdens on the food of the people."

The whirligig of time, we are told, brings its own revenges. In "Justice" for the 16th of last month I read:

"Our veteran comrade Dadabhai Naoroji, whose services to India for more than 50 years are well known, is standing as a Liberal candidate in North Lambeth. We are no friends to Liberal candidates, and we are certainly not enamoured of the set which is supporting Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. But we should regret, nevertheless, if he were opposed by a working man. There are exceptions to all rules and this case is that exception. Mr. Naoroji, more than any Indian living, voices the aspirations of 300,000,000 people under our rule. On that ground we hope he will be returned to the House of Commons."

It occurred to me when I read the above that I had seen something in "Justice" to the opposite effect. I turned up my index and found the following, which appeared on the 22nd September, 1894:

"Social-Democrats can lose the 'Progressives' certain London seats by mere abstention. Why shouldn't we? We owe the 'Progressives' nothing—less than nothing. They are a miserable lot. We thought Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji one of the best of them. He owes his seat to our votes. If we abstain at the next election, he at least must go. What should we keep him in for? He has been of no use whatever to us and of very little use to India. The Liberal Party may seem to our Parsee friend a very grand and glorious institution, but we fail to see how acting the part of a mere Liberal Hanger-on rewards Social-Democrats for the trouble they took in going to the poll for Mr. Dadabhai."

What a virtue is consistency!

"Justice" is owned and controlled by the Twentieth Century Press Ltd. In 1894 Mr. Naoroji held 80 shares in the Company, he now holds 280. These figures relate to the ordinary shares of 5s. 0d., not to the debentures. So that, apparently, "our Parsee friend" has paid £50 for the support of "Justice." Let us hope he is satisfied with his bargain.

Mr. Ebenezer Howard, founder of the Garden City, presided at a meeting held last month at this very latest paradise, to consider the question of the provision of dwellings for working men. The Dean of St. Albans addressed the meeting on the desirability of proper housing for the working classes and urged the men to support a scheme for proper dwellings. Others also spoke.

Was not the Garden City one of those brand new patent schemes for solving the Housing problem?

Mr. Isaac Mitchell, Secretary of the Federation of Trade Unions, was, as usual, unable to be present at the meeting, but, again as usual, sent his blessing by letter.

No meeting of "reformers" is now complete without a letter from Mr. Isaac Mitchell.

J. KAY.

Readers are requested to forward copies of Election Literature, particularly that issued by S.D.F., L.L.P., and L.R.C. candidates, to the Head Office.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is now situate at 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., to which address all communications, Exchanges and Books for review should be sent. General correspondence should be addressed to "The General Secretary."

Articles and correspondence submitted for insertion in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be addressed to "The Editorial Committee."

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

Subscriptions and advertisements for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, and orders for pamphlets, book, &c., issued or sold by the Party, should be addressed to "The Publications Department."

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

	£	s.	d.
Twelve Months

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion
Quarter Column do.
Half Column do.
One Column do.

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.



NO CHANGE.

AT LAST! After paltering with the destinies of an imperial race for more years than the Liberal party care to remember, Mr. Balfour has resigned and the great Unionist Party has gone out of office. At last! After fretting in the shades of opposition for a decade, Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman has assumed control of the reins of Government and the Great Liberal Party has gone into office. The most capable, the most industrious, the most earnest, the most successful Government of modern times (*vide* the Tory Press) and the most disgraceful, the most useless, the most fraudulent, the most shameless Government in the history of mankind (*vide* the Liberal Press) has decided to take a well-earned rest from its laborious endeavours (Tory Press), or has been forced by the pressure of a disgusted public opinion to vacate its position (Liberal Press), and an impossible government of mutually warring elements that cannot by any chance conduct the affairs or in any adequate way discharge the responsibilities of the English people (Tory Press), or a Government representative of the brains of the Empire, a sound and workmanlike Government that can unhesitatingly claim to voice the aspirations of every section of the nation (Liberal Press) has taken its place. The people of England may have which view they like for their ha'penny, and doubtless by far the majority of the people of England will have and unfortunately share, one or the other of them. We would it were otherwise. It *would* be otherwise if we could get the intelligent ear of the people of England—or the working class of England, for we are concerned with no other section. We would have the working class understand that, as a matter of fact, despite all the emphatic assurances of the Capitalist Press to the contrary, there is no real change in the Government. It is the same Government representing the same interests, aiming at the same object, actuated by the same motive. True it is a Liberal Government to-day, whereas yesterday it was a Tory Govern-

ment. But that is only a change of label. It has a Bannerman at its head, vice a Balfour, a Burns at the Local Government Board, vice a second Balfour. But that is only a change of name. True also the change of name and label may involve a slight change of method. It has doubtless become necessary to make a concession to a slowly awakening working class opinion and a departure from the more usual course in the selection of a man for ministerial position who, to the slow-moving working class mind, would be regarded as a champion of working class interest, has been made. But this "Labour" representative has been carefully selected. By years of faithful service which the dirtiest of work has not affected life has demonstrated his trustworthiness and devotion to the interests of his employers. A change of names, of labels, of methods—that is all. The interest represented is still capitalist interest. The object still the retention of the means of life in the hands of the capitalist class, still the subjugation and exploitation of the working class. In no single material respect has the Government changed.

BURNS, P.C., M.P., L.G.B., L.C.C.

IS regard to the appointment of Burns to the Local Government Board, we have just a few words to say. A considerable bulk of nonsense has been spoken and written on the subject by those who claim to represent Labour, mostly to the effect that it is desirable to suspend judgment on the man until he has had a chance to show what he is prepared to do. Now these Labour representatives must know quite as well as we know, why Burns has been selected for the position and the conditions of the appointment. He is selected because he is a "safe" man, because he has acted jackal to the Liberal Party for years, and because he has rarely, if ever, during the course of his Parliamentary career, raised his voice in championship of the interest of the class from which he sprang, but has, on the contrary, *always* been at the disposal of his capitalist friends to defend any act, even acts of palpable atrocity, committed by them. His association with that cold-blooded mediocrity, Asquith, in the murder of the Featherstone miners, and his plea for the use in such cases of the deadliest bullets obtainable, placed him for ever without the pale so far as we are concerned. But notwithstanding his record, his proletarian origin has given him a standing with the ignorant working class which the entire capitalist press has endeavoured, successfully, it must be admitted, to strengthen. To reward him with a well remunerated post was therefore to secure a large measure of working class support which the pressure of adverse economic conditions and the inability of capitalist governments to touch even the fringe of the trouble were tending to alienate. These are the reasons for Burns' elevation. The conditions are that he shall do what may with safety be done to ensure the continued support of the working class to the Liberal Party. There is no question about this at all. Everyone who understands the working class position understands that this is the only condition upon which a capitalist government would consent to the inclusion of an ex-working man in their counsels. Knowing this we do not require to wait for what Burns may do. We *know* what he will do and why he will do it—just as the Tory *St. James' Gazette* knew when, in commenting upon his appointment, they asserted that he could be relied upon to deal with the "whining wasterlism" known as the unemployed.

DIRTY POLITICAL WORK.

LET us forget Mr. H. M. Hyndman's reference to his organisation as being "wholly destitute of political aptitude" he and other prominent members of the S.D.F. make a point of reminding us of the fact.

Last month we dealt with Mr. Hyndman's description of a certain political compact as a "dirty dodge" although he and his friends have been guilty of similar dodges, which they have termed "tactics."

Now we have Cllr. Jack Jones standing up for "clean" politics and publicly denouncing and apologising for his fellow members of the S.D.F. for indulging in "political dirty work," to wit, moving an amendment at a public meeting called in support of a Liberal candidate!

Once the S.D.F. would have considered that it was part of their legitimate work to oppose all Liberals and Conservatives, but not now!

Mr. Jack Jones is doubtless well qualified to speak of "political dirty work!" Is he not the S.D.F. candidate for Camborne, opposing a Liberal candidate with money supplied by some person or persons unknown to the said Mr. Jones, as he himself has publicly admitted?

The scene of this latest exhibition of S.D.F. unity was laid at Stratford Town Hall, at a public meeting in support of the candidature of Mr. C. F. G. Masterman, Liberal, who when he last contested an election (Dulwich) was supported by Mr. J. Hunter Watts, of the S.D.F. Executive, the L.L.P. and by the local Trades Council. Early in the evening the chairman had promised to accept an amendment, and at the proper time Cllr. McAllen and Mr. Ernest E. Hunter, whom the Stratford S.D.F. had invited for the purpose, mounted the platform to submit it. Mr. Hunter's right to speak, he not being an elector, was challenged, and an uproar ensued. Then Cllr. Jack Jones mounted the platform and pointing to Mr. Hunter said:—"I have to apologise for the movement I belong to. I never thought they would have stooped so low as to try and get expelled members of our organisation to do *dirty work* at political meetings. If my Stratford comrades cannot find somebody better to do their *dirty work*, then they had better leave it alone."

We are not here concerned with the quarrel between Mr. Jones and the Stratford S.D.F., but we emphasise this point, that, according to the protegee of the mysterious rich man who is financing his Camborne candidature, to move a Socialist amendment is to do "political dirty work!"

How circumstances alter cases! When Cllr. Jack Jones, Mr. H. Quelch and other prominent members of the S.D.F. supported the recent Parliamentary candidature of Mr. J. J. Terrett, at Stratford Town Hall, without the sanction of the S.D.F. Executive, as required by the rules, was that *clean* or *dirty* political work?

When John Burns, whom the S.D.F. now denounce as a traitor, an apostate, and the like, last stood for Battersea, was he any the less a Liberal, a traitor to the working class, an apostate, than he is now? Had not the S.D.F. previously declared that Burns was a "self-seeker and a traitor to the cause of the people" and that he was "firmly caught in the nets of the Liberal Party"? When therefore the S.D.F. Executive not only instructed their Battersea branch to support Burns but permitted Cllr. Jack Jones to go to Battersea to canvass for him, was that *clean* or *dirty* political work?

When the S.D.F. Executive gave permission to one of their number, Mr. Daniel Irving, to sign the L.R.C. Declaration, a few months after the S.D.F. Annual Conference had decided not to rejoin the L.R.C., was that *clean* or *dirty* political work?

When six branches of the S.D.F. recently demanded that the Executive should poll the organisation as to whether W. Thorne should be repudiated as an S.D.F. candidate, because he had signed the L.R.C. Declaration at the request of the Gas Workers' Union, which is paying his expenses, and is consequently running as a "Labour" candidate, and the S.D.F. Executive broke the rules by refusing to take the poll, was that *clean* or *dirty* political work?

J.K.

SOCIALISM AND DARWINISM.

SOCIALISTS are reproached for being revolutionists, by alleged Darwinians, (who have never studied evolution) as well as by some pseudo Socialists, who pretend to apply Darwinism to social movements. Both sections object to revolution, as unscientific. This objection can only arise from a misunderstanding of evolution, or from a deliberate attempt to switch the working-class off the revolutionary path. Socialism, as expounded by the S.P.G.B. through its official organ and its lecturers, is essentially scientific, never pandering to ignorance or prejudice, or attempting to escape from scientific truths by bowing to unscientific sentiments. This being so, and science being considered from the standpoint of evolution, we must consider the laws of evolution.

"The survival of the fittest," is the law arising from the fact that all things constantly change. It means that an organism, out of harmony with its surroundings, must either adapt itself to the new conditions, or perish. Let us apply this law to society and see if the position taken up by the Socialist is tenable, bearing constantly in mind that man can consciously act on his environment, and thus help to bring it into harmony with his needs.

To-day capitalist society is composed of two classes, a working class producing all the wealth of society, and a capitalist class that, as such, produces nothing. The members of the working class own none of the means of living, and are only allowed to use the means owned by the other class, on the condition that a profit is made out of their power to labour by hand or brain, which, being their only possession, they are forced to sell to obtain the necessities of existence. This system of society has evolved from previous forms in which were other class distinctions. Just as, following the lines laid down by Darwin, we trace the evolution of man from his ape-like ancestors, so, from that stage onward, we trace his social evolution.

The Socialist deals with society, that is with man as a social being. He does not run counter to the laws which govern physiological development; rather does he find the same laws running parallel, both in biology and in sociology.

Take man as he was just a few stages ahead of his fellow animals. He lived in caves and trees; his means of subsistence were the spontaneous products of nature—roots, fruits and nuts. The development of articulate language, and the discovery of the use of fire enabled him to convert fish into an article of food, and caused a revolution in his means of securing an existence. Stationary conglomerations of individuals were transformed into migratory co-operative groups, following the shores of lakes and seas, and the courses of rivers. The numerous dangers that now confronted man, and the more easy acquirement of food by co-operative effort, caused the cementing together of various groups on a co-operative principle, holding wealth, that is, food, etc., in common. Thus the earliest known form of society was what is termed Primitive Communism, that is, a society based upon the common ownership of the means and necessities of life, with those means used co-operatively for the benefit of all members of the community. This had its reflex in a form of government, crudely democratic, to correspond with the economic basis of that society. Thus man carried on collectively the struggle for existence.

The next stage was common ownership within the consanguine group, i.e., within a group whose members considered themselves to be descended from a common ancestor. With the growth of chattel slavery, first of all in the Eastern hemisphere, the domestication of animals and the development of agriculture, we can trace the growth of the patriarchal system. This system was a further step from primitive communism, as, while it was still mainly a system of consanguine collectivism, it contained the beginnings of private property—other than purely personal articles, such as ear and nose rings, &c.

In other tribes property was held by the women. This, the matriarchal system, arose

from the fact that the earliest known forms of property were the weapons of fighting and hunting and domestic utensils, and, as the division of labour took place along the line of sex, the women, who had control of the domestic utensils in the first instance, continued to control other property as it came into existence, though the nature of that property had changed. This lasted throughout the earlier forms of society, down to the Greek and Roman civilisations, with the exception of the minority of tribes who had established the patriarchal system.

Even in early society, after the break-up of primitive communism, there were struggles over the ownership or non-ownership of wealth. After the discovery of the art of writing, and the ascendancy of man's power over Nature, the struggle for existence took the form, not so much of the character of man against Nature, as class against class. Then, after generations of development of the matriarchal and patriarchal systems, a revolution took place in some parts of Asia and Asia Minor that completely overthrew the form of society based upon a real or fictitious blood-relationship of its members, and established the system of political society based upon territory rather than kinship, the basis of modern civilisation. The various struggles that took place in the old Roman Republic are common knowledge to most students of history. The struggle for political supremacy between the holders of large and small estates, the ownership of chattel slaves, etc., continued till that form of society, a bastard form as it was, was finally overthrown and feudalism became general in Europe. The struggles that took place between the old feudal nobility and the rising merchant class that had developed out of the old guildmasters, the growth of manufacture, &c., with which all historical students are familiar, culminated in the overthrow of feudalism and the establishment of capitalism. The development of machinery and the application of steam thereto, completed the work and put the capitalist class into supreme power. To-day the struggle proceeds between the capitalist class and the working-class.

Present day capitalist society is, therefore, seen to be the result of evolution, consisting of a series of revolutions, mainly consummated by the force of arms. Sixty years ago, in the "Communist Manifesto," the evolutionary theory had been applied to society, even before Darwin's "Origin of Species" had appeared. It is pointed out in that manifesto, how the economic factors develop within society until the political and social superstructure of that society prevents their further development. Society then undergoes a revolution in order to harmonise its social and political conditions with its economic foundation.

To-day the production of wealth is a social act, but the wealth is appropriated by individuals; and although man's power of producing wealth is greater than ever it has been in the world's history, yet we see the greatest poverty. Each class that controlled the means of living in the past, did so by virtue of controlling the political power and endeavouring to maintain the political and social superstructure best suited to the maintenance of its economic power. Society only entered upon a new stage of progress when the class beneath overthrew the class above and established its own particular social and political forms. To-day the ruling class, the capitalist class, is wholly destitute of the ability to govern society. It performs no useful function; and the biological law, that when an organ or organism becomes useless, it atrophies and finally perishes, will apply here. The ring, combine, and trust have proved the capitalist class to be superfluous, while the chronic poverty of the workers in the midst of plenty, the evil of unemployment, and the thousand-and-one evils that afflict modern society, show it to be unable to control the productive forces. It must, therefore, give way to a more vigorous class that shall establish a new system in consonance with the social character of production. That class can only be the working-class.

Professor R. Darwin, in delivering the first portion of his inaugural address to the British Association at Cape Town recently, stated that in applying the evolutionary method to the state, we found that the state would progress until it reached the point when it could no longer properly perform its functions; then a revolution was necessary for that progress to go

on and a new state to be established. This from the son of the man whom these pseudo-scientists and bogus Socialists would use against us! Thus after 60 years of comparative obscurity, the revolutionary scientific principles are acknowledged as correct. So will the revolutionary scientific attitude of The Socialist Party of Great Britain be acknowledged as correct, and rescued from obscurity when those ill-balanced evolutionists and bogus Socialists have been prevented from misleading the workers, and attempting to rob them of the vigour which a clear knowledge of the scientific principles of Socialism imparts.

Socialism then, is a necessary complement to evolution. He who admits evolution in Nature generally, but denies it to society, has grasped only half its application and cannot form a correct judgment. He who would deny that evolution is a necessary factor in social evolution, is a dangerous misleader who must be opposed on every occasion. The revolution from capitalism to Socialism can only be accomplished by a conscious act on the part of the working-class. For the workers to clearly understand their position in society and the historic role they are called upon to play, they must be educated along these lines. To educate them in these principles, and organise them on this basis, is the work of the Socialist Party. When the unconditional surrender of the capitalist class shall have been demanded by an educated intelligent proletariat, the hour of revolution will have struck. With the establishment of the Socialist Commonwealth by the workers, it will have been demonstrated that the effete and corrupt capitalist class has perished—that the workers have survived. It will have been demonstrated that Socialism means "the survival of the fittest."

E. J. B. ALLEN.

THE PILLORY.

The Labour party was under no delusion; for if a working-man was taken into the Cabinet, they knew why, they knew the reason behind his being taken in.

Keir Hardie.

It is now announced that by one of his last official acts Mr. Gerald Balfour has appointed Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald as one of the Local Government Board representatives on the committee (Central Unemployed).

L.L.P. organ.

Is what material respect would an appointment to the Central Unemployed Committee at the hands of a Tory Capitalist Minister differ from an appointment to the Local Government Board at the hands of a Liberal Capitalist Minister? Answer Hardie. And if there is no difference may we not know the reason behind both appointments? Is it not that the ministers know their men?

We find it difficult to understand the point of view of those "Labour men" who have been congratulating Mr. John Burns on his acceptance of office. We naturally supposed that all would now see that he had definitely gone over to the enemy. Nevertheless it appears to some Labour members and candidates who are pledged to rigorously abstain from identifying themselves with either Liberal or Tory Party that this final act of repudiation of the Labour cause by John Burns is one upon which both he and they are to be congratulated. It passes all comprehension.

Justice, S.D.F. organ.

"Justice" adds the situation is Gilbertian when "we have the ineffable Winston Churchill, another colleague of Mr. Burns going down to support the Liberal opponent of Mr. Alderman Bowerman, who, as a member of the Labour group on the L.C.C., signed the letter of congratulation to Mr. Burns." Agreed. It is Gilbertian. But when Mr. Will Thorne, a very prominent member of the S.D.F., that through its organ gives at the absurdity of Mr. Bowerman congratulating Mr. Burns himself, as a prominent member of the Parliamentary Committee,

signs a similar letter of congratulation, Gilbert pales his ineffectual fires. Perhaps "Justice" will now jeer Mr. Thorne, but as Mr. Thorne constitutes a valuable asset to "Justice,"—perhaps not!

Never was the I.L.P. so great, so strong, so full of courage as it is to-day. From every corner of the land reports pour in telling of crowded halls, revival, and organisation.

*J. Bruce Glasier
(I.L.P. Executive)*

Mr. Glasier's remark follows immediately after an adverse criticism of Mr. Parker. The ordinary person will probably incline to the idea that the great "Independent" Labour Party is full of courage because of the encouraging reception their advances receive from the Liberal Party upon which some of them are apparently dependent. It is reported that after Mr. Parker's speech, a prominent Liberal rose to advise his fellow Liberals to give one vote to the Liberal and one to Mr. Parker. He hoped the Labour men would reciprocate the entente cordiale!

The Durham miners are balloting as to which of four constituencies Mr. J. W. Taylor shall stand for at the coming election. One of the four seats which are being balloted upon is Chester-le-Street, which is represented by Sir James Joyce, and last week Mr. J. H. Wilson, at one time member for Middlesboro', addressed several meetings in the constituency in support of Joyce.

Labour Leader.

After which striking example of Miners' consistency, it is not surprising to read in the official organ of the I.L.P. that the I.L.P. is making remarkable progress among the miners. It is. The similarity in the mental taggles of both parties' representatives, simply stands up to strike one.

But circumstances are telling in our favour. At home the hopeless incapacity and irreconcilable antagonisms within the two prevailing capitalist political factions unquestionably help us.

*H. M. Hyndman, S.D.F.
Dec.*

Irreconcilable antagonisms within the two Capitalist factions! And this from "the Father of English Social Democracy"! O Lor!!! will someone post Mr. Hyndman the S.P.G.B. manifesto?

Mr. Shackleton, speaking at Nelson recently, formulated a programme of startling revolutionary character. . . He declared himself in favour of Home Rule, Registration Reform, Payment of Members, Triennial Parliaments and the Initiative and Referendum. . . *J. F. Green, S.D.F. E.C. (Seriously).*

The question I wish to bring under the notice of English Socialists . . . is whether the time has not arrived when they should formulate a vigorous demand for all the political measures I have indicated (Second Ballot and Payment of Members and Election Expenses). . . *H. W. Lee, S.D.F. Sec. Dec.*

Mr. Quelch is very ironical at Mr. Shackleton's expense, very ironical. But all the same Mr. Shackleton's immediate demands are not so very insignificant when contrasted with Mr. Quelch's fellow S.D.F.'ers. Mr. Quelch's satire like other peoples curses, invariably comes home to roost—if the metaphor will bear the strain.

THESE BE YOUR GODS, O ISRAEL.

Must the rhetorical and literary boom of drums and clang of cymbals the long expected and suddenly happening resignation of the Tory Government takes place, and the Liberal party marches bravely forward to take up the burden, the troubles, the cares, the anxieties, and the salaries of office. A great demonstration at Albert Hall where the Prime Minister administers—as the "Daily News" so well puts it—the programme of the Liberal Party if it is returned to power at the election in January. The People's advocate—"Reynolds"—shrieks in triumph at the Radical victory shown in the statement of the programme and denounces, beforehand, as traitors to the people, all those who either vote Tory or abstain from supporting the Liberals. This is what Republicanism appears to lead to. In addition, a clever campaign is being conducted by the "Daily News" on behalf of "Social Reform" versus "Tariff Reform," the while dishing up the ancient, hoary ideas of taxing the land and establishing small holdings, wisely refuses to have any discussion upon its proposals carried on in its columns. Some of their dupes might be enlightened even by one or two letters and that danger must be avoided. In the first article, however, it is clearly laid down that the way to remedy the evils admittedly existing—an admission forced from the Liberal Party by the Tariff Reformers—is by a series of wise and moderate measures in the direction above indicated. In face of these attempts to ensure the return of the Liberals to power in January as friends of the workers a brief survey of their career will be in order.

The names—Conservative and Liberal—were first adopted at the election of 1830. Previous to that the parties were known as Tory and Whig. Originally the Tory Party represented the Landlord class, the remains of the Feudal Barons, while the Whigs represented the new commercial class that had been steadily growing in wealth and power since the 15th century. The civil war of 1642-49 was the big outward evidence of the internal antagonism existing between these two classes, and although the ebb of the tide brought out the Restoration it could not alter or even more than modify the power the commercial class had won as a result of the struggle. Steadily the Whigs grew in power till the time of George III, when another temporary set back, followed by the American Civil and Napoleonic Wars, took place. But it was to be the last.

In 1830 the Liberals were returned to power with the largest majority on record, namely, 301, and they were in power in eight out of nine Parliaments up to 1865. The great Reform Bill of 1832 finally placed the political power in the hands of the plutocracy out of those of the aristocracy and completed the work for which the Liberal Party had existed. From this time onward the economic and social divisions between aristocrats and plutocrats, blue bloods and traders, have been broken down, the last flickers of the struggle taking place over the Factories Acts, and to-day the trader is a peer like Lord Bass, and the aristocrat a trader like Lord Dudley, Penrhyn, Elvaston, etc. Whenever a new swindle is being floated on the Stock Markets, some titled person is asked to lend his name—for a consideration—to go upon the prospectus as a draw to the unwary or those "who love a Lord." And this reaches high up the scale as well as low down. This combining of economic and social interests has obliterated all the real differences that at one time existed between the Conservatives and Liberals as political parties. Apart from the subsidiary struggle between the official agents of the capitalist class for the spoils of office, the only reason why the two parties are kept in existence is to gull the workers into the belief that they will materially better their conditions by returning to power—at one time, Liberals, at another, Conservatives. The advocates of Liberalism are just now detailing various actions of the Conservatives, when in power, against the workers interests—and they have plenty of material to use. For the moment, we may leave these advocates at their work while we take up the question of the claim of the

Liberals to be the "Party of Progress."

First let us look at their record in industrial matters concerning the workers. They claim credit for having legalised combination among the workers in 1824. True! they were in office when the Act was passed, but the manner in which Mr. Francis Place outside and Mr. Joseph Hume inside the House of Commons planned, intrigued and finally smuggled—there is no other word for it—the Act through Parliament, is unequalled in the annals of that edifice of trickery. In 1825, when the same Liberal Government, having woke up to what had been done, repealed the Act, the Prime Minister and Lord Chancellor stated they were unaware it had ever been passed! And we have clever politicians to-day, with not one-tenth of the ability and power of these two men, who imagine that, in circumstances vastly different, they will be able to get measures passed benefiting the workers without the capitalists recognising it!

When Lord Melbourne was returned in 1830, he appointed a Commission to enquire into the standing of the trade unions—then, of course, secret societies. The Commission consisted of W. Nassau, senior, professor of political economy at Oxford and Mr. W. M. Tomlinson, a lawyer. They advocated such terrible measures of repression that the Government did not dare to recommend them to Parliament, but put them into operation in detail. Thus, the Lancashire Miners and the Southwark Shoemakers suffered imprisonment in 1832, the Bermondsey Tanners in 1834, and in the latter year the notorious case of the Dorchester labourers also occurred when six agricultural labourers were sentenced to seven years transportation, and two of them sold into slavery as soon as they landed in Australia. All the above for merely joining their Trade Unions! During this period a big agitation was going on among the working class against the fearful conditions of employment in the Mills and Factories, which conditions could only be described as hellish. The Liberals opposed strenuously every Factory Act that was brought forward on behalf of *Women and Children*, to say nothing of men. Cobden, Bright and Gladstone, deservedly the leading lights of canting hypocritical Nonconformity, turned their religious tenets to commercial account by demanding that, in the words of Jesus, the nation should suffer little children to go unto them that they might wring profit out of the hardly formed bones and tender flesh of children.

But all the cant was not on their side alone. The philosophic Radicals of the Utilitarian school, while practically Atheists, were just as strong opponents of any restriction being placed upon the hours of labour of women and children, as the snuffing religious humbugs. Mr. Roebuck, for many years "Father of the House of Commons" and a member of this school, wrote to his wife in 1838 the following description of the interior of a cotton mill:—"The place was full of women, young, all of them; some of them large with child, and obliged to stand twelve hours each day. Their hours are from five in the morning to seven in the evening, two hours of that being for rest, so that they stand twelve clear hours. The heat was excessive in some of the rooms, the stink pestiferous and in all an atmosphere of cotton flue. I nearly fainted."

Roebuck stood about six feet high and was well proportioned. Yet in 1844, six years after the above letter was written, he opposed the ten-and-a-half hours Bill and said the description of misery had been exaggerated, "take the women-of-all-work in London, compare them with the labouring girl in the factories and you will find that the condition of the latter is a sort of Paradise!"

Yes! the sort of Paradise in which a strong man nearly fainted upon the occasion of a short visit. And it was this sort of cant that was brought forward by the intellectual and industrial giants of the Liberal Party in opposition to the workers' demands. The Tories, smarting under their defeat of 1832, supported the agitation for the Factories Acts, which did not directly affect them, and it was during their spell of power from 1841 to 1847 that the Act forbidding the employment of *Women and Children* in the Mines was passed (1842).

Not only were the Chartists prosecuted with the utmost rigor of the Law by the Liberals, but their treatment of Ernest Jones was particularly inhuman—a sample of the mercy one may expect who runs counter to the interests of the ruling class.

When the great Lock-out of the Building Trades took place in London in 1859-61, characterised by Sidney Webb as the greatest trade union struggle on record, the Liberal Government sent the Sappers to work on the Chelsea Barracks as blacklegs. The same Party opposed F. Harrison's Bill to Legalise Trade Union Funds, but made up for laxity in this direction by sending the soldiers down to Mold in Flintshire when the miners were out on strike in June, 1869, and shooting them down without even the formality of reading the Riot Act.

The Act of 1871 that was supposed to place Trade Unions upon a secure basis, was such a fraud, actually making the position of the worker worse than before, that the agitation was continued till in 1875 the Tories passed the Act that Trade Unions have existed under up to the present time. Still, something was done, as for instance the imprisonment of seven women in South Wales for shouting "Bah" after some blacklegs, and of some South London gas-stokers for merely preparing to strike. (1871.) It was during the same Government's office that Mr. Plimsoll, who had for some years been carrying on an agitation on behalf of the Merchant Seamen, was thrown out of the House of Commons for calling certain Liberal ship-owners "cold-blooded murderers" because they sent men to sea in rotten ships that could never reach their supposed destination, to gain the insurance money. The Lead Line Bill—popularly known as the Plimsoll Line—was passed by the Tories in 1875.

Equally bad is the record of the "Party of Progress" in the political and intellectual as well as industrial fields. It is always claimed by the Liberals that they were the extenders of the Franchise and of intellectual liberties all round, but this is only a first-class example of the saying regarding the giving of a lie a start. A hardened old Whig like Justin McCarthy has to admit in his "History of Our Own Times" that the Reform Bill of 1832 "left the working classes almost altogether out of the franchise . . . It broke down the monopoly which the aristocracy and landed classes had enjoyed, and admitted the middle classes to a share in the law-making power," and "this was all the more exasperating, because the excitement and agitation and success of the Reform Bill was brought about by working men." Not only so, but, as stated above, the Liberals were returned to power in eight out of the nine Parliaments from 1830 to 1867, and returned upon the express promise to extend the franchise—only to show how consistently they can break promises. In 1866 Gladstone went out of office rather than accept a £6 franchise, which he said "would give the workers a majority, a thing neither he nor any of his friends ever intended to do."

The "cute old trickster, Disraeli, took the opportunity to score a popular triumph against the Liberals by introducing, and finally placing upon the Statute Book, a Bill for the £10 franchise which the bulk of the workers vote under to-day. The Property Qualification and Jewish Disability had been abolished under the same leadership in 1858. When Mr. Forster was piloting the Education Act through the House of Commons in 1871, he gladly accepted the help of the Tories to pass the religious clauses of the Bill, while he and his friends threw out the clauses of the Ballot Act, that provided for the payment of Election Expenses, in the same year.

Later on in the '80's, when Bradlaugh wished to affirm, instead of taking an oath to a God he did not believe in, the Liberals threw him out of the House of Commons by physical force to show their love of intellectual freedom. Just now they are making all the capital they can out of the South African War, for which, by-the-way, they always voted supplies, but conveniently forgot, that in 1882, Gladstone's Government bombarded Alexandria and shot down the Egyptians, whom Gladstone himself described as "a people rightly struggling to

be free," in the interests of the Bondholders, whilst the worst Coercion Acts against Ireland were passed during this period.

It might be urged that all these facts are ancient history, and do not apply to present Liberals or affairs. Well! let us take the last period when the Liberals were in office, namely, from 1892 to 1895. They were returned upon John Morley's famous "Newcastle programme," which contained, among its items: "Old Age Pensions," "One Man one Vote," "Miners' 8 Hours," "Taxation of Land Values," "Ending or Mending the House of Lords," "Home Rule," "Payment of Members and Election Expenses," etc., a programme much more definite and "advanced" than that shadowed forth at the Albert Hall, but although in power three years, not one of these items became law. It is said, of course, that the House of Lords stood in the way, but many of the items are Budget matters which the Lords do not control, while it may be noted that Gladstone appointed more Peers than any other Prime Minister. Moreover, when in 1871 the House of Lords threw out his Army Reform Bill he took it to the Crown and had it signed and made Law in spite of them! If, with one Bill, why not with another. When Keir Hardie asked for half-a-day to discuss the Unemployed, the Liberals could not spare the time, yet shortly afterwards they spent half-a-day passing resolutions of sickening adulation to the Duke of York on his marriage. When the Tories brought in an Old Age Pensions Bill the Liberals opposed and threw it out.

Nemesis, however, dogged their step, and if they could not pass any of the above "Reforms" into Law, opportunities were given them to show their impartiality when called upon to take action between employer and employed.

In September, 1893, the Miners, working for the Tory, Lord Masham, at Featherstone, were on strike, and during a demonstration the soldiers were marched against them and fired upon them, killing two and wounding several others. Mr. Lowther raised the matter in the House of Commons on the question of who was to bear the expense of the troops being sent to Featherstone. In the course of his reply Mr. H. H. Asquith (Home Secretary) made the following remarks to the "Labour" M.P.s. "Where are the men who made these statements? (that the soldiers had been sent to help the Employers) . . . it is a very easy thing to go about the country speaking to excited audiences where you are safe from refutation or reply; but it is a very different thing . . . to come here to the House of Commons . . . face to face with the Minister you condemn and fight the matter out. These gentlemen know as well as I do, and would admit it if they cleared their minds and tongues of cant, that there is no man in the country who would not have acted as I have done, and who would not have felt it his bounden duty to supply the Local Authorities with such a force as in their judgment was necessary to supplement the local resources at their disposal."—*Hansard*, vol. 17, pages 1725-1726.

The above extract effectually disposes of the statements made by Asquith's friends that he did not send the troops to Featherstone. His own admission should be proof enough to the most hardened Liberal. Note also that not a single "Labour" member, then or since, repudiated Asquith's statement that anyone of them would have sent the soldiers to Featherstone if they held office—a splendid piece of evidence as to the position they occupy.

An inquiry commission was appointed which reported in January, 1894. It was pointed out in this report that the rifles used would carry three miles and kill, and it was therefore suggested that weapons of shorter range—say 200 or 300 yards—should be used in civil disputes as innocent persons were liable to be injured.

Mr. John Burns—not the Right Honourable then—said: "He could not agree with the point which had been raised as to the alteration of the weapons and ammunition to be used in cases of civil riot; that would only alter the injury caused; some people might say 'what about shooting down innocent people?' They must take their risk of that. If innocent people attended affairs of this sort they did so at their own risk. He did not hold the Home Office responsible in this case."—*Hansard*, vol. 20,

pages 1305-1306.

And yet we hear glib queries as to why an Office, that men of wealth and influence would sell their souls if they had any to obtain, is given to a working engineer! Let the above answer.

The price of this act of treachery to the workers, of faithful servility to his paymasters is a seat in the Cabinet and £2,000 a year.

Note, moreover, Burns' attempt to shift the responsibility of sending the troops to Featherstone off the shoulders of Asquith, after the latter's own admission of the act.

One point, however, is logically taken by the assassin's defender. Admit the right of the capitalist to have his wage slaves slaughtered when they revolt against their miserable conditions, and then the slaughtering may just as well be done by long ranges as by short range guns. Innocent people—three miles away—must take their risk of attending affairs of this sort! But the very admission of this right of the capitalist explains why both Tory and Liberal Press, from the "Daily Mail" to the "Daily News" have joined together in a chorus of congratulation to "Honourable John" though the adjectival noun is rather early. Burns may be said to have got "on" before, to have got "Honour" of its kind—now, but there is not the slightest possibility of his getting "Honour" either in the near or ultimate future.

During 1891, a Liberal capitalist, Mr. C. H. Wilson, M.P., of the Wilson Steamship Company, Hull, had a strike of dockers occur at his wharves and brought in blacklegs to break the strike. The obliging Home Secretary (Asquith again) sent a gunboat to the scene of action Hull to protect the blacklegs and shoot down the dockers if they showed signs of being troublesome.

In 1895 the Liberals were defeated on cordite

and have been out of office 10 years, but can

any fair-minded person pretend in face of the

brief account already given of their career

during the 19th Century, that there is the

slightest difference between them and the

Conservatives as far as the workers are concerned? I think not.

It is for the working class to study and realise

that while one section of the community—the

capitalist class—own the means of life of the

whole community, the remainder of the

community are slaves to that section. Whatever

label a political party or person may wear—

whether Conservative, Liberal, Radical, Reform,

Labour or any other—the one question for the

working-class is "do they stand for the retention

of a system allowing a small section of

Society to exploit the other, the working class?"

If so, no matter with what qualification or

modification, if any, then they are necessarily

and inevitably the enemy of the exploited

and must be so branded. Fine promises will

avail them nothing. In the words of Wendell

Phillips, "WE NEVER FORGET," but keeping

the facts clearly in front of our fellow

workers' eyes march steadily to the goal of our

Emancipation.

J. FITZGERALD.

WOOD GREEN BRANCH REPORT.

The propaganda of the Party in the district continues, notwithstanding the weather. Some very good meetings have been held by the local comrades in fog and rain, and wind, and all those other elements which are usually considered detrimental to out-door meetings. Whether it is that the pressure of economic conditions is beginning to have a stimulating effect on the minds of the inhabitants, or whether it is a mere curiosity to know what possesses us that we should so diligently persist in our efforts, the fact remains that there is an increasing interest shown in our work. Probably the cause is to be found in the excellent lectures that have been delivered during the past three months in Dovecote Hall. These lectures have been an unqualified success. The approaches to Socialism, when examined in detail, are intensely fascinating, and we believe that considerable impetus has been given to the study of our Propaganda by means of these lectures and the excellent discussions that follow. We most heartily recommend a visit to the Hall to anyone, especially to those whose pet objection is Socialism. We can promise such a fair field but no favour.

D.K.

BATTERSEA SOCIAL.

In this, the alleged festive season, it is pleasant to find that some people enjoy themselves. Truly, on Dec. 10th, with a fog so thick without that it might have been a blind man's holiday, it was surprising to find Sydney Hall, Battersea, teeming with such a joyous gathering. The occasion was a tea and social arranged between the West and South West London branches of the S.P.G.B. The Battersea, Paddington, Tooting, Fulham and Peckham branches were well represented. Clerkenwell was also represented, and contributed materially (or should it be immaterially?) to the amusement of the evening.

But I am anticipating. After the tea had been hidden from view, Comrade Leigh of Paddington was prevailed upon to take the chair, and an excellent and varied programme was gone through. It would be invidious to praise particularly, because where all were excellent none could be more, and, (let me confess it) I have forgotten many of their names.

Suffice to say, the Social was a great success, and all were of opinion that this, the first joint Social, should not be the last; for such a pleasant relaxation from the stern uphill fight against Capitalism, cannot fail to bear fruit in better knowledge of each other, in closer comradeship and increased enthusiasm for the cause we have at heart.

The fun still ran high, when the stalwarts from the outlying branches carved their way through a dense London particular to the railway station in time for the last train home, to snatch a few hours sleep before commencing another week of drudgery, brightened, however, by memories of that evening, and by hope for the time when all shall be better than well.

BOLUS O' THE DITCH.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

T.W.—The statement, like many another in the journal mentioned, is incorrect. No reference to Mr. Hyndman as "Uncle Harry" has ever been made in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. Notwithstanding which we shall doubtless have it frequently brought up in evidence against us as an exhibition of bad taste. However—

W.L.D. (Leyton).—Certainly. Every contribution receives careful consideration.

VOL. I.

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Well bound in stiff boards,

Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be sent to Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

S. P. G. B.**A REUNION**

of Party Members and Friends
will take place on

Friday, January 26

at 7 p.m.

in the large hall of the

COMMUNIST CLUB,

107, CHARLOTTE ST., W.

VOCAL and INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC,
DANCING.

ADMISSION FREE.

Printed by Jacomb Bros., 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 1A, Caledonian Rd., London, N.

S.P.G.B.
North London District Council.

LECTURES FOR JANUARY.**: DOVECOTE HALL, :****78, High Road, Wood Green, at 7.30.****Jan. 7th—R. ELRICK:****Subject to be announced.****.. 14th—A. ANDERSON:****"Socialism and Present-Day Politics."****.. 21st—J. FITZGERALD.****"Past and Present."****.. 28th—J. KENT:****"The General Election."****DISCUSSION. ADMISSION FREE.**

S. P. G. B.
BATTERSEA BRANCH.

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

WILL BE GIVEN AT

SYDNEY HALL**36, YORK ROAD, BATTERSEA.**

AS UNDER—

Jan. 7th—T. A. JACKSON:**"A New Year's Address."****.. 14th—H. NEWMAN:****"Marxian Economics."****.. 21st—F. C. WATTS:****"The Unemployed."****.. 28th—F. S. LEIGH:****"How Socialism will affect Society."****Chair at 7.30 sharp. Discussion.****ADMISSION FREE.****ECONOMIC CLASSES**

Will be held Sundays Jan. 14 and 28 at 3 p.m.

Instructor - J. FITZGERALD.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 1.**MANIFESTO**

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN,

Containing, in full detail, a statement of the

Principles, Policy, & Rules

OF THE PARTY.

Post free, 1 copy, 11d.; 6 copies, 5d.; 12 copies, 9d.
Special terms for larger quantities. Orders and remittances should be forwarded to the Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as
well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE

1A, CALEDONIAN RD., KING'S CROSS, LONDON, N.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—G. Wilson, Sec., 14, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets every Saturday at 8.30 at above address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 309, North End Road, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—C. Thorp, Sec., 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Tuesdays at 8.30 at the Co-op. Stores, 79, Grove Rd., Holloway.

PADDINGTON.—All communications to the Secretary at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road, where Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Ethelrie Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8 o'clock at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in month at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—J. G. Graver, Sec., 52, Frith Road, Leytonstone. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Comrades desiring to acquire or sell books on Social Science, etc. (new or second-hand), should send particulars to the Publication Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., from whom the undermentioned unsoiled works may be obtained at prices stated.

CAPITAL.**A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION.**

By KARL MARX.

(Published at 10 6.)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES.**A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR.**

By PROF. J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.

(New Edition, Revised, Published at 10 6.)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY.**A STUDY OF TOWN LIFE.**

By B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

(Illustrated by Folding Maps, Diagrams, &c.)

(Published at 10 6.)

Carriage Free ... 4s. 6d.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 18. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Readers who can endorse the foregoing in its entirety are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the nearest Branch or with the General Secretary. See Directory, page 8.

The Extinction of Petty Enterprise.

By KARL KAUTSKY.

Translated from the German by H. J. NEUMANN and revised by the Author.

1. PETTY ENTERPRISE AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP.

Some think they are talking wisdom when they tell us "There is nothing new under the Sun," "as it is to-day it has always been and will always remain." Nothing is more erroneous and stupid than such assertions. The newer development of science shews us that there is nowhere a standing still, that in Society, as in Nature, continual development is perceptible.

We know to-day that originally man lived animal-like by gathering whatever Nature offered him spontaneously. But he invented one weapon after another, one tool after another, each more perfect than the other. He became fisherman, hunter, cattle-raiser, finally settling down to agriculture and handicraft. Ever more rapid was the course of development until to-day, in the age of steam and electricity, it has become so rapid that we are able to follow it with our eyes without comparing it with past ages.

The manner in which men gain their livelihood, in which they produce those things necessary for their sustenance depends upon the character of their tools, their raw material,—in one word, upon the means at their disposal for the production of such things, upon their means of production. But men have never carried on production isolated from each other, but, on the contrary, always in larger or smaller communities, whose form for the time being depends upon the then prevailing mode of production.

From the development of production consequently follows the social development.

The form of society and the relations of its members to each other are, however, closely connected with the forms of property recognised and maintained. Hand in hand with the development of production proceeds also the development of property. An example, one relating to peasant farming, will make this clear. A complete peasant farm comprises two branches of production, cattle-breeding and agriculture. Until the eighteenth century there prevailed with us universally and prevails frequently to-day, pasture farming. This necessitates, however, the common ownership of the soil. It would be folly were each peasant to have his separate piece of grazing land, to fence it in, to keep a shepherd of his own, and so on. Consequently the peasant clings, where pasture farming is in vogue, with the greatest tenacity to the common pasture and the common shepherd.

It is different in agriculture, if the same is carried on with the simple implements of the peasant farm, without machines. Common cultivation of the agricultural land of the peasant community by all the members of the community is, under such circumstances, neither necessary nor conducive to successful production. The implements of peasant farming demand that a single individual by himself or together with a few others (in a group as represented by the peasant family) shall cultivate a

small piece of land. This cultivation, however, will be carried on carefully and will yield greater results the more freedom of control the cultivator is able to exercise over his property and the more fully he enjoys the results of cultivating and improving his farm. Agriculture in its beginning forces into existence petty industry and this necessitates the private ownership of the means of production, if it is to develop fully.

For instance, with the ancient Teutons the common ownership of the soil which prevailed so long as pasture-farming (and hunting) remained the principal means of gaining their sustenance, disappeared more and more and made way for private ownership of the soil, in the measure in which petty peasant agriculture came to the fore. The substitution of cattle-raising in stables for pasture-farming was the death-blow to the common ownership of land. Thus, under the influence of economic development, in consequence of the progress made in farming, the peasant has developed from a communist to a fanatic in private ownership.

What applies to the petty peasant holds good with the handicraftsman. Handicraft requires no associated labour of a large number of workmen. Each handicraftsman toils either alone or together with one or two assistants, who belong to his family or his household. As in peasant farming, so also in handicraft, the single workman or workman's family maintains a separate establishment and therefore handicraft, like petty peasant farming, necessitates private ownership of the means of production which it uses, and of the products which it creates, in order to fully develop its competency, its power of productivity. In petty industry this product of the workman depends upon his individuality, his skill, his industry, his perseverance. He consequently claims it for himself as his individual property. He is, however, unable to develop his individuality in the production if individually he is not free and does not freely control his means of production, that is to say, if these are not his private property.

This has been realised by the Socialists and specifically expressed in their programme by the words "the private ownership of the means of production is the basis of petty industry." But they hold at the same time that the economic development of Bourgeois society leads of necessity to the extinction of petty industry. Let us follow up this development.

2. COMMODITIES AND CAPITAL.

The starting points of Bourgeois Society were peasant farming and handicraft.

The peasant family originally satisfied all their requirements. They produced all the articles of food they needed, all tools, all garments, built their own house, etc. They produced as much as they required, but no more. Gradually, however, owing to the progress of Agriculture, they reached a stage when they produced a surplus of things, which they did not want for their immediate use. They were thus placed in a position to exchange this surplus

for products which they themselves did not produce or not in sufficient quantities, products which they welcomed, as, for example, a weapon, a tool, or jewels. By the means of exchange these products become commodities, that is, products intended not for use or consumption within the establishment in which they were produced, but for the purpose of exchange for products of another establishment. The wheat produced by the peasant for his own use was not a commodity; the wheat he sold, however, was. To sell means nothing else than to exchange a certain commodity for such an one as is welcome to everybody and in this way becomes money, for instance, gold.

As we have seen, the peasant became, in the course of economic development, a producer of commodities. The handicraftsman in his independent petty enterprise was from the first a producer of commodities. And it was not only a surplus of products that he sold, but with him production for sale was the primary feature.

But the exchange of commodities presupposed two conditions, firstly, that every single concern produced a different class of goods and that division of labour had entered society, and secondly, that those who exchanged were free to dispose of their products, that the latter were their private property.

The more that, in the course of economic development, division of labour in various trades progressed, and private property increased in extent and significance, the more generally was production for own consumption superseded by production of commodities.

Division of labour finally resulted in buying and selling becoming a separate business, which was pursued exclusively by one class, the merchants. These derived their incomes from buying cheaply and selling dearly. This does not mean, however, that they were able to fix the price of commodities at their own discretion, for the price depends ultimately upon the exchange value. The value of a commodity is determined by the average amount of labour expended in its production. Its price scarcely ever coincides exactly with its value. The former is determined not only by the conditions of its production, as is its value, but also by the conditions of the market, primarily, by its supply and demand, in what quantity the commodity is placed on the market, or is in demand. But the price is also subject to certain laws. It varies with different times and places. If, then, the merchant wishes to obtain a margin between the buying and the selling prices of the commodity, as profit, he must, as a rule, buy his commodities when and where they are cheap and sell them when and where they are dear.

When the peasant or handicraftsman bought commodities he did so because he required them for himself or his family as means of production or subsistence. The merchant bought commodities, not for his own use, but to utilise them so that they might yield him a profit. Commodities and sums of money used for such a purpose are capital. It cannot always be said of a commodity or a sum of money that it is capital. Tobacco bought by a merchant for the purpose of being sold at a profit is to him capital. Tobacco bought for his own smoking is not capital.

The original form of capital was that of merchants' capital. Nearly as old is the usurers' capital, the profit of which consists of interest pocketed by the capitalist for commodities or sums of money lent.

Capital was produced at a certain stage in the production of commodities, of course upon the basis of private property, which, as we know, forms the basis of the entire production of commodities. But under the influence of capital private property assumed a new feature, in fact, an additional feature. Besides the Petty Bourgeois feature, which was in accord with the conditions of petty enterprise, it displayed also a capitalist feature. The defenders of present private property point only to its Petty Bourgeois feature, and yet it would be blindness to overlook to-day the capitalist feature of private property.

At the stage of economic development with which we are now dealing, when capital was only merchants' and usurers' capital, there were but few features of that capitalist physiognomy visible, but these are worthy of remark.

The income of the peasant or petty handicraftsman under the reign of petty enterprise depended primarily upon his individuality and that of the other members of his family, upon his industry, skill, etc. On the other hand, the amount of the merchant's profit depended upon the money he had for purchasing commodities and the commodities he possessed for sale. If one sells £10,000 worth of tobacco, one's profit, other things being equal, will be 100 times larger than if one sells only £100 worth. The same applies to the usurer. Hence the income of the capitalist, as a capitalist, depends mainly upon the amount of capital he possesses.

The labour power and capacity of the individual are limited, as is also the amount of products a workman is able to create under certain circumstances. It cannot exceed to any degree a certain average. Money, however, can be accumulated to any amount, to that there is no measurable limit. The more money one has, the more accumulates when it is used as capital. Thus the possibility of acquiring immeasurable riches exists.

But private property produced yet another possibility. Private property in the means of production implies the lawful possibility for everybody to acquire such and also the possibility of losing it, that is to say, of losing the source of their existence, and thus sinking into abject poverty. Usurers' capital already presupposes want. He who possesses what he requires will not borrow. By exploiting the helpless position of the necessitous, usurers' capital becomes the means of precipitating want.

The acquisition of wealth in idleness, the immeasurable riches of some, the abject poverty of others, are features perceptible in the capitalist physiognomy of private property. But they were hidden as long as merchants' and usurers' capital were in the first stage of development. The worst feature—poverty—became apparent to but a small degree, the lack of property remaining the exception and not the condition of large numbers of the people.

There were other exploiters, besides the merchant and usurer, as for instance, the feudal lord in the middle ages with whom we cannot deal here without diverting too far from our subject. And all those exploiters, the merchant and usurer included, were dependent upon the existence and success of petty enterprise in town and country. The proverb, that if the peasant had money, everybody had money, still held good. Commerce did not destroy petty enterprise, but sometimes even extended it. The usurer whilst draining his debtor of his resources, had no interest in absolutely ruining him. Poverty—the loss of the means of production—did not appear as a regular social phenomenon, but as a particular misfortune caused by an exceptional calamity or exceptional incapacity. Poverty in such cases was regarded as a Divine trial, or as the punishment for laziness, carelessness, and so on. This conception still prevails largely in Petty Bourgeois circles, though now dispossession has become an occurrence of an altogether different character to what it was formerly.

(To be continued.)

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

Our next issue, which will be published on March 3rd, will contain a further instalment of "The Extinction of Petty Enterprise," by Karl Kautsky, also an article on "Independent Labour at the Polls," showing the extent to which "Labour" candidates have compacted with the Liberal Party for the purpose of securing election to Parliament, etc. Readers should ensure an early copy by forwarding 1s. 6d. to the S.P.G.B. Offices, 1a, Caledonian Rd., Kings Cross, London, N., for which sum THE SOCIALIST STANDARD will be sent post free to any part of the world for twelve months.

P. Gillies was expelled by the Tottenham Branch of the Socialist Party of Great Britain at their meeting on January 28th, for supporting the Liberal Candidate for the Tottenham Division at the recent parliamentary election.

ANOTHER QUACK REMEDY.

WITH the multitudinous "remedies" for the unemployed problem, one wonders why it should exist at all, or, at any rate, why it is allowed to assume the alarming proportions it does each winter. Notwithstanding stone yards and emigration, Queen's Funds and the rest, however, the problem remains, and what is more important, increases. But at last the "first practical proposal" has been made. It emanates from that quarter from which one would anticipate "practical" proposals.

The Salvation Army! A sum of £100,000 has been placed at the service of the Army to finance a scheme for putting "a certain section of the deserving poor" "back to the land." Without going into details, the nett result of this "practical proposal" is to create about 200 small holdings of 5 acres each, on which the unfortunate settler will have to work to produce (a) £25 per annum which will be demanded of him as rent; (b) 5 per cent. interest on the sum advanced, and (c) his own livelihood in competition with the larger and more economically organised farms both here and abroad. After 40 years he becomes a "peasant proprietor."

So far as these potential peasant proprietors are concerned, their unemployment can, if they succeed in complying with the conditions, be accepted as cured; but for such a scheme to be boomed in the Press as, in any way, a solution of the problem of unemployment, is, misleading and untrue.

For, after all, what leads to this unemployment? Why is it that no one among the ranks of the employers of labour will employ these people? Simply because they cannot do so and conform to the necessities of the system, i.e., show a profit. And this, because the system has developed so as to expose, in bold relief, its essential contradiction, and by virtue of the private ownership of the means of living, and its necessary corollary, wage-labour, to increase with its development, the disproportion between the amount produced and the amount received as wages. It is the accumulation of this difference that produces the glutted market, the depression in trade, the economic crisis, the "over-production" and the "unemployed problem."

Such a result being the necessary outcome of the capitalistic method of production, how can the effect be removed, and the cause of the effect retained? It is an answer to this riddle which well-intentioned people try to find by means of such artificial arrangements as that mentioned above. For my part, I accept the inevitable, and believe that if capitalism produces the results alleged against it (and they cannot be denied), then to remove the results you must remove capitalism.

The purchasing power of the bulk of the community is limited to their wages. Their wages represent a declining proportion of the wealth produced. The proportion of the community so affected increases. Therefore, the surplus, over and above wages, represents an increasing proportion of wealth which goes to a decreasing proportion of the community. This is the prime cause of unemployment. The new scheme (if indeed it can be called new) in no way tends to rebalance those proportions, but, if anything, to enlarge the disproportion. It is, therefore, no solution of the problem.

To attempt to solve an "unemployed problem" that is produced by the capitalist mode of production and yet retain the mode of production is folly and a criminal waste of time. Capitalism out of its own inherent weakness is rapidly preparing its own downfall by the production of such problems as that of unemployment. That downfall is inevitable. There is no escape from it. Upon its ruins only an intelligent working-class may construct the newer system which, by the organisation of the production of wealth for the satisfaction of the wants of those who produce it, will preclude the possibility of such anomalies as the general poverty problem of our time, with the more acute poverty and unemployment always attendant upon it, necessitating, as it at present does, abstinence and starvation in the midst of plenty, and because there is plenty.

DICK KEST.

A TORY CANDIDATE ON SOCIALISM.

MAJOR ADAMS, late Tory candidate for Woolwich, has been at pains to explain his objections to Socialism to some of his electors.

In the historical portion of his address he is reported to have said that the French Revolution was caused by the writings of Voltaire and Rousseau, and that its constructive "failure" was the failure of Socialism.

In point of fact the writings of these two individualists had little effect upon the revolutionary movement: their opinions, in common with the ideas dominating the French Revolution, were the outcome of their economic environment. The growth of commerce and industry in France rendered feudal restrictions increasingly unsuitable and unbearable, and Feudalism was abolished that "Freedom" should reign. The Revolution brought in the classic age of *Laissez-Faire* and devil take the hindmost; the tyranny of capitalism under the mask of freedom.

Free competition, not Socialism, was the objective of the French Revolution. To imply that such an "inherently capitalist revolution" was Socialism is a fine example of historical ignorance.

Next in the lecturer's consideration of scientific Socialism he fell foul of the theory of value. "Labour," he said, "was to be measured by its scarcity or utility, not, as Marx said, by time." Truly, the scarcity of labour would make a curious measure of it.

The Major, however, gave a concrete example of his meaning by saying that "if a man came across a diamond while mining, according to Marx the diamond would have no value because no labour had been expended upon it." Presumably the man was mining for carrots, for if he was mining for diamonds some labour certainly *was* expended on the diamond.

The whole thing, however, is a travesty of the theory of value, for value does not depend upon the labour of one individual. Value is the amount of labour that is socially necessary to produce an article under the prevailing conditions of production. If one can produce a commodity in say two hours that it takes in general three hours to produce, its value will be three hours' labour, nevertheless; whilst if an article can usually be produced in two hours but a few men take four, two hours' labour still represents the exchange-value of the article.

If a diamond exchanged according to its usefulness it would not be so highly prized as it is now. The search or mining, cutting, etc., of a diamond, call for the expenditure of a great deal of human labour, and this makes the diamond's value. If diamonds, to take a classic illustration, could be made by mixing cheap chemicals in a glass of water, diamonds might be ten a penny.

A thing may have considerable use-value but yet have no exchange-value—air is a familiar example; but the exchange-ratio or value of a given use-value is determined by the labour required to produce it. Price, of course, fluctuates around value according to supply and demand, but the labour cost of production mainly determines both supply and demand in the last resort.

Major Adams seems to have hardly a nodding acquaintance with his Marx, for he gave him as saying that laborious work should be paid most wages, whereas Marx contents himself with analysing and explaining the laws of wages. Neither does Marx speak only of manual labour, for there is no manual labour without some intellectual labour, and no intellectual labour without some degree of manual labour.

The different prices or wages of the various kinds of labour-power are mainly due, apart from historical standards of life, to the fact that they require differing amounts of labour to produce and perpetuate. Thus the more skilled worker required in the production of his power to labour, not only a more protracted period of training or education than his unskilled fellow, but also a higher grade of living to maintain his skill or fitness. The spread of machinery and automatic devices is, however, bringing labour nearer to one common level, sometimes, indeed, reversing the places on the labour market of "skilled" and "unskilled" labour power.

The Major's objection to Socialism that it would be impossible to fix the different values

of labour-power is, therefore, cut, from under his feet in two ways; firstly, by the levelling influence of the systemization of industry, and secondly by the fact that under Socialism the category of wages is abolished. The remuneration of the workers ceases to be the cost of their subsistence and becomes the product of their labour. All having equal facilities of development and culture, the difference between the various workers becomes merely one of convenience, and though some occupations may, during the few hours that it may be necessary to toil, be less pleasant than others, the balance between the supply and demand of labour may be simply adjusted by shortening the hours of the least attractive, or lengthening those of the most sought after.

Our critic is concerned that the capitalist should obtain a reward for his "intellectual labour." The intellectual labour of the modern capitalist would appear to be confined to a study of the Companies' List and of the prices on 'Change. The whole of the useful labour in his concern is being done by hired workers, from the manager to the shop boy.

"A comparison of the modern labourer with 100 years ago shows," says Major Adams, "that the surplus value of labour did not altogether go into the pocket of the capitalist." The fact of it being surplus value at all shows that it had already gone to the capitalist class. Further, according to an eminent statistician, the wealth of this country has increased eight times during the last century. Now with modern intensity of toil and insecurity of employment, will the Major assert that the working class has materially benefited by this increase? The very increase in the wealth wrung from the workers enables the possessors to purchase wage-saving machinery that augments the poverty of the working class by depriving them of their livelihood.

"Under the Socialistic system," we are told, "any accumulation of capital would be forbidden. There would be no pictures painted, no statues carved, no books written."

Major Adams is either himself confused or tries to confuse his hearers; for what is capital? Capital is wealth used as a means of obtaining profit. With the abolition of the profit system, capital is abolished, but wealth remains; and the accumulation of social wealth for social use becomes the function of the community. Wealth, being no longer confined to a degenerate few, but being at the command of those who create it, the misery and degradation of the many which now prevents them appreciating and demanding the use and collective possession of fine pictures, statues, buildings and books, is abolished; and art, instead of being the reflex of the unhealthy and irrational tastes of a few, becomes the beautiful expression of the healthy, vigorous, and well-balanced life of the people.

Socialism, we are also informed, will increase misery by removing the responsibility of parents for the bringing up of their offspring, thereby causing the population to unduly increase. The Major should have explained why it is that, in general, the easier it is for persons to bring up children, the less forethought for children becomes necessary—as we go from the poorest to the wealthiest in society—the smaller is the number of children to the family. Those upon whom, according to the Major's theory, forethought is most strongly enjoined by the necessity and difficulty of bringing up their children, these, the poorest, have the largest families. Evidently the more wealth, health, and leisure are spread among the people, the more forethought and enlightenment should we find.

Our critic also stated that Socialism would destroy individual liberty and the rights of minorities, but the Major's assertion is clearly comprehended in the light of the class struggle. Just as capitalist interests are opposed to those of the workers, so the capitalist idea of liberty is opposed to that of the working class. From Major Adams' point of view Socialism does not mean individual liberty, because it would necessarily curtail the liberty of the capitalist to batten upon the misery of the many. When the capitalist professes such a tender regard for liberty it is not usually because he is anxious about the freedom which the working class have not got, but rather about his own liberty to exploit and grow fat upon the toil and sweat of the people.

The tyranny under which the working class groans, the unending and hopeless drudgery

that is their lot, these Socialism alone can end. It will abolish also, it is true, the liberty of the capitalist to grind the faces of the poor, but it will establish the basis of true freedom for mankind by abolishing class antagonisms and class tyranny, and uniting all in a bond of labour with common interests.

The hypocrisy of the assertion, from such a source, that Socialism would disregard the rights of minorities, becomes apparent when we reflect that an unscrupulous minority rule to-day by cunning and by force, and usurp to themselves all the good things of life created by the labour of the people. It is the cry of the capitalist brigands to the just power that is rising to end their crime.

Unity being found upon essentials by socialised production and distribution, government becomes, under Socialism, little more than the administration of things in the common weal. By the liberation of the mass of mankind from excessive toil and lack of leisure, each is enabled to develop to the full his individuality. Where all interests point one way coercion finds no place. Since at last the people rule, and it is unprofitable to the vast majority to exploit a few, the best guarantee of liberty to each individual becomes the guaranteeing of the like liberty to every other individual.

The Major's last objection is positively childish. In order to avoid work under Socialism, people would pretend to be sick and the hospitals "would very soon be full of idlers," he said. This, too, in spite of the fact that by the more efficient organisation of industry by the elimination of the waste of competition and of the senseless luxury of "Society," and by the utilisation of all capable of work in the community, the amount of toil would be enormously reduced, and its nature made pleasant and healthy. If there were a grain of truth in that objection to Socialism we should find to-day, with the tremendous provocation of exhausting toil and demoralising conditions, that not a single Sick Benefit Society could exist, because the greater part of its members would be malingering. That the very reverse of this is true even to-day shows the utter foolishness of such an objection to Socialism.

Indeed, the Major's objections are so obviously feeble that, were they not so common, we must almost apologise for dealing with them. We know his real objection. It is that he is placed on the shoulders of toiling humanity and does not envy their lot. He finds it good to be alive in his place, and has no wish to change; for he might have to work. Besides, quoth he, a bird in the hand is better than a bird in the bush. The Major therefore makes it his duty in serving the class whose interests are his, to prove to the workers by Euclid and other means, that a bird in his hand is best for them. F.C.W.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

GREAT stress is laid on the dictum that Communism is not a mere party doctrine of the working class, but a theory compassing the emancipation of Society at large, including the capitalist class, from its present narrow conditions. This is true enough in the abstract, but absolutely useless, and sometimes worse, in practice. So long as the wealthy classes not only do not feel the want of any emancipation, but strenuously oppose the self-emancipation of the working class, so long the social revolution will have to be prepared and fought out by the working class alone.

The French Bourgeois of 1789, too, declared the emancipation of the bourgeoisie to be the emancipation of the whole human race; but the nobility and clergy would not see it; the proposition—though for the time being, with respect to feudalism, an abstract historical truth—soon became a mere sentimentalism, and disappeared from view altogether in the fire of the revolutionary struggle. And to-day, the very people who, from the "impartiality" of their superior standpoint, preach to the workers a Socialism soaring high above their class interests and class struggles, and tending to reconcile in a higher humanity the interests of both the contending classes—these people are either neophytes, who have still to learn a great deal, or they are the worst enemies of the workers, wolves in sheep's clothing.

FREDERICK ENGELS, 1892.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is now situate at 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., to which address ALL communications, Exchanges and Books for review should be sent. General correspondence should be addressed to "The General Secretary."

Articles and correspondence submitted for insertion in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be addressed to "The Editorial Committee."

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

Subscriptions and advertisements for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, and orders for pamphlets, book, &c., issued or sold by the Party, should be addressed to "The Publications Department."

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months	£	s.	d.
	6	1	6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion	£	s.	d.
Quarter Column do.	0	2	0
Half Column do.	0	5	6
One Column do.	0	10	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.



THE PARLIAMENTARY MANŒUVRES.

THE results of the elections call for little comment. With the assistance of a couple of most effective war-cries the Liberals have successfully played upon the credulity of ignorance and have been returned to power in rather greater numbers than was anticipated. The meaningless piffle of "Hands off the people's food," when so large a number have no food and the remainder barely sufficient to maintain their efficiency as profit-producing machines; the hypocritical indignation carefully simulated against Chinese Slavery in South Africa while the wage-slavery of old England passes unnoticed—these two, augmented by a few subsidiary cat-calls anent Education (having reference to the squabbles of rival religious bodies entirely) the Drink Traffic (treated not as a problem resulting from poverty but as the exact and absurd opposite), and the like, have inspired the working class to one more exhibition of well-nigh unmixed folly (a rather greater exhibition than usual), and have encompassed the overwhelming triumph of almost everything capable of standing on two legs and wearing a Liberal label. On the flood, a few dozen persons, mostly made up so as to resemble as nearly as possible the genuine Liberal article, have floated into political position, and will doubtless use their best endeavours to qualify for eulogy as men of "moderation of demeanour, decency of manner, free from swagger and assumption, and with respect for the audience they address in the House of Commons," which, on the authority of Mr. John Morley, are the characteristics and qualities of the "Labour" representatives who, by the grace of capitalism and the stupidity of their working-class constituents, were able to affix "M.P." to their names during the life-time of the last Tory administration.

THE LIBERALS' BLANK CHEQUE.

The Liberals have gone in absolutely programless and unpledged, and may be relied upon to

abide by the conditions of their election. Certainly it will not be possible to fairly accuse them of violation of the solemn (!) undertakings of the hustings if, at the end of their tenure of office, they have no more than a small, clean sheet of working-class legislation (so-called) to show for their alleged labours. The working class, whether they were conscious of it or not, have, as a matter of sober fact, presented them with the blank cheque for which they appealed, and though it will doubtless occur that some of the "Labour" representatives, if they get the opportunity and can do so with becoming respect, will bring forward some of the reform propositions with which their election addresses were mildly besprinkled, and although the Liberal Party, being astute enough to understand when the moment may be considered opportune for a graceful concession, may be pleased to accept such measure (duly modified, of course) they may be relied upon, having the blank cheque, to spend it mainly in the maintenance of the status quo. And as the status quo means, on the showing of capitalist statisticians, abject poverty for at least a third of the entire working class population, and precious little more for the other two-thirds, and as the great bulk of the reform measures the most advanced candidate advocated when seeking election may find a place upon the statute book without appreciably disturbing the status quo, the wealth producers are unlikely to find, even in the most favourable circumstances, that their last state is better than their first was. Then perhaps they will in time-honoured fashion—particularly if the Tory party have managed to find an attractive cry—return again the "Peace with Honour" gang, as distinguished from the "Peace, Retrenchment and Reform" crew. But that is on the knees of the gods. Meanwhile it will be our business to continue to combat by all the means at our disposal, the forces of stupidity and knavery which have operated to produce the confusion of working class thought manifested so unmistakably in the election results, confident in the knowledge that the pressure of economic circumstances must sooner or later, and sooner than many suppose, compel the consideration of the issue we alone of the political parties of England present, must effect the adoption of the attitude we alone take up.

THE ISSUE.

With characteristic honesty the principal organ of Nonconformity was at pains to delude a sufficiently deluded electorate into the belief that the issue of the elections was to be Social Reform versus Tariff Reform—Social reform being, as every perfect ignoramus in political history will be aware, a Liberal party speciality implying great happiness and prosperity for the working class; Tariff Reform, spelling poverty and wretchedness for the working-class, being the sole objective of the Conservative Party. This issue the "Daily News" argued should impel every member of the working class to oust Toryism and all its apostles and instal Liberalism surely upon the Governmental benches.

Unfortunately for the "Daily News," however, every student of political history knows that the Liberal Party's record of reforms does not at all compare to the disadvantage of the Tory Party's. Unfortunately too, the Liberal Party of to-day has no programme of Social Reform at all. The Pawky Bannerman in his much belauded pronouncement of policy at the Albert Hall, well maintained his reputation as the compleat shuffler (or if the term pleases better, political engineer) talking airily round a number of subjects without giving anything in

the nature of a definite undertaking regarding any of them, preferring, statesman-like, to leave it to his enthusiastic followers in Press and on platform, to construe his remarks as they thought fit. Unfortunately still further, it would signify exactly nothing if the Liberal Party had a set programme of reform measures just as it signified nothing when the famous Newcastle programme was elaborated and upon which the Liberal Party last secured power. If anybody was in doubt before that election as to whether the programme was manufactured for the purpose of catching votes or not, the subsequent action of the "Party of Progress" in deliberately breaking the promises they unquestionably had full power to redeem, must have entirely removed that doubt. And unfortunately once more, even if they had been honest enough to pass their reforms, the working class would not under the conditions then and now existing, have benefited tuppence. All of these reforms have been passed in other capitalist countries without result and all of them will doubtless be passed, after many of the usual sham-fights between the two capitalist factions, in England.

Therefore, the "Daily News" in endeavouring to convey the impression (1) that the Liberal Party is the Party of reform, (2) That the Liberal Party's programme is the programme that the "Daily News" in somewhat ambiguous terms set out, (3) That the Liberal Party's alleged programme if carried would beneficially affect the working-class and that, therefore (4) the issue was Social Reform v. Tariff Reform was guilty of misrepresentation on all counts and flat lying on at least two of them. For the intelligent working-class the issue was and is poverty versus comfort, misery versus happiness, slavery versus freedom, Capitalism versus Socialism and the overthrow of the first and the realization of the second will involve the extinction of all political parties representative of capitalist interests including even that great Party of Progress, the Liberal Party itself.

NOTES OF INTERROGATION.

Lord Durham and Sir James Joicey, both large Colliery owners, sent letters to Mr. Tlios. Burt, miners' candidate, wishing him success and enclosing £100 each towards his election expenses. Why?

Mr. C. D. Hodgson, Liberal, declared he had spent £10,000 in fighting elections. Why?

Every responsible member of the capitalist Liberal Party has disposed of all the really awkward questions relating to the condition of the working-class by the easy method of referring to the appointment of Burns to the L.G.B. Why?

The "Daily News" says the election was fought not upon what the Liberals may or may not do, but what the Tories have done. Why?

Mr. W. C. Steadman (Sec. Trades Union Parliamentary Committee) and Mr. Isaac Mitchell (Sec. Federated Trade Unions), were strongly supported in their election campaign by these well-known democrats and Labour sympathisers: Lord Carrington (Board of Trade) and Sir Edward Grey (Foreign Office). Why?

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Rules and Conduct of Debate, is a useful manual of procedure for all who take part in public, society, and other meetings. Sixpence net; Ellis & King, 175, Highbury Hill, N. *Labor* (St. Louis). *Weekly People* (New York).

IS THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY SUFFICIENT?

[The completion of a correspondence between two members of the S.P.G.B., the first portion of which appeared in the November issue.]

DEAR COMRADE.

I do not see why we should be concerned because your friend says it is utterly impossible to view Sociology as a picture, for if he means that it is impossible to look at Sociology from an entirely detached point of view (that is, quite objectively), then I am not aware of its possibility having been maintained. But why is Sociology indicated in particular? Why not Biology also? If it is impossible in one case, it must be impossible in the other, or, indeed, in any branch of natural science. That the difficulties are greater in some cases than in others is obvious, but the difference is less than is usually supposed.

There is, however, this difference between Sociology and Biology: regarding the animals human interests are practically identical, hence there is comparative uniformity of human views respecting the animal world; but regarding society, with its parasites and workers; class interests, (and consequently class views), are hopelessly in conflict. The modern social scientist must take his stand on the side of

THE GLASS SOCIALLY NECESSARY

if he is to be logical in his philosophy. In the domain of Sociology to pretend to face society in the interests of all its classes is idiotic, confusing, "ethical" and hypocritical, whilst logically it is an impossibility. To stand for the reconciliation of opposing class interests, except by the abolition of classes through the triumph of labour, is either to confusedly deliberate or to deliberately confuse.

If, then, it is impossible to really objectively view things which we can only know and judge by subjective means, must we therefore abandon all attempt to discount subjective interference and get as near to a detached view as our human limitations will permit? Obviously not, for the detached point of view remains the counsel of perfection, the ideal scientific viewpoint.

That few even attempt to attain to this, or that none can completely so view social, physical or biological phenomena, simply means that to err is human.

In getting at the truth of any matter the observer is hampered by his physical shortcomings, by the limited knowledge accumulated to his day, by his interests or by the phase of life most to the fore in his time. A few men rise to such a height in their perception of truth that their works are enduring and stand as landmarks of the different stages of human knowledge. Aristotle, Roger Bacon, Darwin, Spencer, Marx and Lewis Morgan, are some examples of this in the domain of science.

To know and discount personal disturbing influences, and to get a point of view as nearly detached as possible, must be the aim of every true scientist. What other plan has your friend to propose? Does he propose that we should bury our heads in the sands of our narrowest environment because it is impossible to get a perfect view of the universe? Or does he hold, as we hold, that

ALL TRUTH IS RELATIVE;

that while in Sociology (which, as I have said, is the most subjective of sciences) the difficulties of a scientific point of view are increased nevertheless, for a generalization to be even relatively true it must be the result of, or in harmony with, an even and thorough view of each department of human knowledge at that epoch?

You say that the Socialist propaganda, which is necessary to the revolution, has little economic significance, and that the creation of a demand for Socialism is an intellectual rather than an economic process. We have here the shadow of our old friend—an uncaused effect: for if the intellectual process is not caused by the influence upon the individual of the conditions of existence, whence does it arise? The fact that

the Socialist propaganda (the demand for Socialism) arises in every country with the development of capitalism, is, in itself, a sufficient answer to our question. Further, to expect that Socialist propaganda can be the motive force changing economic conditions, is really to reject the materialist conception of history as explained by Marx in the extract I sent you.

Economic conditions (i.e., methods of wealth production and distribution) change gradually and independently of the will of man. They evolve by pressure on the means of existence and along the line of greatest economy, the line of least resistance, and thus form the real cause of intellectual and then political revolution. The Socialist propaganda and demand for Socialism is brought about by the decreasing harmony between the social (political) system and the economic mode of producing wealth (associated industry). The demand for Socialism is Nature's preparation for the compulsory adaptation of the social organism to this economic change, a readaptation that must take place if humanity is to advance.

Strictly speaking, Socialism is not a revolution in economic conditions, but is a

REVOLUTION IN THE SOCIAL SUPERSTRUCTURE.

which the ruling class has created in harmony with its material interests; the ruling class itself being the creature of economic necessity. Socialism changes (or rather abolishes) the class which controls, and the manner of profiting by, associated industry; destroys attempted barriers to the further development of this, and places the social organism in a position of healthy reaction with its economic environment.

The demand for Socialism is, then, in the main, the direct effect of the pressure of economic conditions on the individual organism. Just as a writer is great, and is understood, when he sees more fully and shows more clearly what others are being forced to (unarticulated) feel and believe, so the Socialist propagandist, more deeply impressed by economic conditions and social contradictions, voices more fully and clearly what others are economically being led to think, and so brings their aspirations to a focus. Thus the demand made by economic and social conditions on the individual organism is voiced again in the class struggle which can only end with the destruction of the social system that is growing more and more out of harmony with the economic basis of society.

In your first letter you said: "The point is, then, to demonstrate that the all important, the dominating factor in society is its economic conditions." I endeavoured, briefly, to demonstrate that economic conditions (the how, where, and quantity of the necessities of life) undoubtedly do form the dominant and root factor in all life. In your second letter you say: "It is undoubtedly true that the ultimate explanation of any force or condition in society is to be found in the means adopted by men to satisfy their material wants." But you add: "When you have explained the origin of man's ideas as arising through economic and material channels, that does not explain the possible reaction of these intellectual forces on the economic and material conditions." The problem, though essentially the same, is restated. Let us examine it.

If it is admitted that the origin and ultimate explanation of man's ideas, social relationships, and intellect itself, lie in material conditions: if, in fact, the evolution of the human family from

THE EARLY SPECK OF PROTOPLASM

(which differed from the substance around it only in that it could absorb fresh substance and broke in two when its size became too great for the cohesion of its material) is due to, and is explicable only on the ground of the varying nature of the struggle for existence, then the rest follows as a logical consequence, for it is evident that the "ego" (or whatever fanciful name one may give the individual), is but the result of past conditions of the struggle to obtain the necessities of existence. Obviously, therefore, the intellect can only reflect or redistribute under the pressure and through the channels of present economic conditions the influence of past conditions. The reflex or secondary action of the "ego" must, then, ever remain inferior in intensity and effect, but tend

to be similar in direction, to the material conditions of life which cause and modify it. Intellectual, like all other forces, tend to run in worn channels; and this fact of the "inertia of the mind" would cause mankind to continue always in the same rut were it not that changing conditions compel mankind to readapt itself to them. Intellect in itself would perpetuate, but not innovate, if changing material conditions did not compel it to change the direction of its activities.

This is important, let us insist upon it. Given the individual organism and the laws of its economic environment, it is obvious that the organism (which, with its experience, has been moulded by past conditions of life) will endeavour to play out its course along the line of least resistance and will continue into present conditions, in so far as they are similar to the past, the action forced on the individual by past environment. And since by pressure on the means of life, natural selection of the most economic methods, and the consequent

MODIFICATION OF THE ORGANISM.

(individual and social) the line of least resistance continually changes its direction, the organism (social and individual) must adapt itself (be adapted) to the changing economic conditions or lose its place in the economy of nature.

Now it will be seen that although with growing complexity of structure the individual grows more powerful and his influence on surrounding conditions appears to grow in importance; yet the individual can never become greater in power than the material conditions of which he is but the creature and reflection, for the secret of his growing power is the growth of his power to adapt himself to, and become more pliable before, these same material conditions.

You object to my analogy of the clay balls because it leaves out the reaction of the individual on his environment. But the analogy was not made to illustrate that. It simply illustrated the fallacy of the "identical environment" idea, and showed how some may be Conservatives and some Socialists in a given society. A purpose that I hope the illustration has served. An analogy is, of course, a comparison between different things which have nevertheless some features in common. Hence no analogy can be perfect, and argument by analogy is dangerous. It is enough for the purpose if the analogy illustrates (for it cannot prove) the working of some general law. In my example it was only the formation of individuality, or the cause of individual differences, that was illustrated.

You ask for an illustration of the reaction of the individual on his environment, and you suggest an excellent example, the colonies. Let us take, in the first place, the animals transferred by the white man to the "colonies" during historical times. We find

EXAMPLES OF INDIVIDUALITIES

(or I should say, organisms) developed by conditions in the broader and more differentiated area of the old world, running feral in the new. The horse, the result of continuous natural selection in the old world, transplanted in its developed form to the new world, found itself more adaptable (intelligent) and better fitted to obtain the necessities of life than the native animals whose economy and distribution were consequently considerably altered. The rabbit, developed by the keener old world struggle for existence, transferred to Australia, found itself more fitted to exist than many of the natural inhabitants because the latter were the creatures of a less diverse or more restricted environment. Thus the animal and vegetable economy of Australia became modified by the reaction of the rabbit's inherited nature upon it. So the human inhabitants of parts of the old world, their individual and social organisms the results of a keener and more varied struggle for existence, were economically forced to introduce themselves and their superior naturally selected methods of production into America and Australia, where their greater adaptability and more efficient means of obtaining food and shelter caused them to oust the less adaptable native populations, and to develop afresh on lines determined by their newer material conditions.

We see, then, that at bottom it is the methods

of wealth production and distribution which determine the existence or extermination of races, the development of their intellect and the societies they form. Any known more profitable method of production will inevitably, in the long run, take the place of the old.

In grasping the reaction of the individual on his environment.

A PATHOLOGICAL ILLUSTRATION

may help us. A man, let us say, living under conditions conducive of typhoid fever, catches that disease and communicates it to others, thus spreading the effects of his own environment. If many live in typhoid-giving circumstances there will be a severe epidemic: indeed the disease will probably break out at several independent centres. But if very few live under conditions conducive of typhoid fever, there will be no epidemic and the disease will rapidly disappear. Hence individuality only gives a little longer life to an effect produced by external causes, for if the same causes are not operative elsewhere, the disease finds no food to live upon and is starved out.

The spread of Capitalism to Japan is another illustration to hand. In Japan, development from a kind of Feudalism to Capitalism has been very rapid. The visits of merchants, the settlement of Europeans bringing their methods of production with them to Japan and starting factories with the cheap labour available, combined with the existence of the requisite degree of energy and adaptability on the part of the Japanese, and the favourable natural resources and geographical position of the country, enabled the more efficient methods of production to rapidly oust the old and brought about a change (a feature of which was a revolution) in Japanese society that placed it in harmony with the changed economic basis, and with the interests of the new class thereby given power.

The Socialist propagandist also propagates a policy, a class interest, created by circumstances. If the same circumstances are acting around, the ideas propagated spread in milder or more acute form. If the same causes do not operate around the propagandist, his efforts will make but an eddy that will rapidly die away. Our propaganda is, then, simply the means of giving definiteness, cohesion, and conscious expressions to the direct effects of economic and social pressure.

THE PROBLEM OF MAN'S CONSCIOUSNESS

now begins to assume truer proportions. For just as the social organism in a more or less embryo stage may be seen in the lower social animals, and in higher and higher forms as we go from the most primitive folk to the most civilised nation: so man's well developed consciousness may be seen in lower degrees of development among the less developed organic beings. Man's intellect can only put together things he has seen or known, but he can put them together in new order and form fresh patterns. By the process of reasoning (that is to say, by mental comparison) man can, to some extent foretell the results of certain actions if he has known similar results to occur (even though separately or partially) in the past. Growing to grasp the essential oneness of Nature and her inviolable order, and finding that he cannot alter her course to suit his phantasies, but that he is Nature's plaything and his sane wishes are Nature's wishes, man realizes that his salvation lies in knowing Nature and in more completely adapting himself to her in all her moods, for, if the forces within him fail to respond to the forces without, he is annihilated.

Thus the pressure of economic necessity, acting on the individual and on society, brings man's consciousness into line with the new conditions of the struggle for life. The seeking of self interest, necessarily common to all sentient beings either individually or socially, brings humanity into contact with the obstacles that bar its path. An increasing number of the class economically necessary, by contact with the obstacle in the line of their interests and helped by the teaching of those who have explored it more fully, become conscious of the existence of the barrier and of the necessity for its removal. Economic pressure continually swells their ranks till a sufficient number of the rising class have become conscious of their mission, and aided by the ripeness of material

conditions, throw down the obstacle to their progress with a crash.

Taking human society we can then say in view of the organic unity of the human family, that changing conditions of wealth production compel human beings to change the form of society in adaptation to the economic change, and therefore that all over the world and in every historical epoch, varied by climatic and racial conditions, "the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange and the social organization necessarily following from it form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch." F.C.W.

ELECTION ITEMS.

The Northampton Branch of the S.D.F. ran two candidates with the object of securing a solid vote.

The Southampton Branch of the S.D.F. complain of "the mean trick of the Liberals in bringing out a second candidate in order to defeat us."

The Southend Branch of the S.D.F. issued a "No Vote" manifesto.

The Plymouth Branch of the S.D.F. supported the Liberal Candidate (*vide Daily News*).

The Stratford S.D.F. issued an "abstain from voting" manifesto and endeavoured to hold a meeting, but were broken up by Masterman's supporters.

J. J. Terrett held meetings in Stratford Grove in favour of the Liberals and made collections for the S.D.F. war chest.

Dan Irving and Geo. Belt both signed the L.R.C. declaration and then the L.R.C. declined to adopt them.

The S.D.F. delegates at the Amsterdam Congress gave as their reason for not affiliating to the L.R.C., that the L.R.C. refused to allow its candidates to run as "Socialists."

Geo. Belt, the S.D.F. "Labor" candidate for Hammersmith, issued a leaflet denouncing the Liberals for refusing to "arbitrate" as to who had the greater right to be the candidate, and expressing his willingness and desire to "arbitrate."

"Justice" describes Liberals as "liars" "thieves" etc., and it is with "liars" and "thieves" that they would arbitrate.

John Burns is at a loss to decide whether his success was due to the manifesto against him issued by the Battersea S.D.F., or to the telegram wishing him success which the Countess of Warwick (S.D.F. member) sent, and which was read at Burn's meeting at the Latchmere Baths on Wednesday, January 10th.

John Burns returned the Countess's compliments by telegraphing to the Camberne Liberals. "The Socialist have bitterly opposed me."

The Camberne Liberals got their own back by "taking it out" of Will Thorne.

The Countess then tripped over on her motor car to sympathise with "poor Will," and stayed at Upton Park "quite twenty minutes."

If the Stratford S.D.F. deserved to be publicly reprimanded and apologised for, as was done by Councillor J. Jones at Stratford Town Hall, for engaging Mr. E. E. Hunter, a once expelled member of the S.D.F. to do "dirty political work" for them, what punishment is deserved by Councillor Jack Jones for engaging Mr. J. J. Terrett, a *thrice* expelled member of the S.D.F., to do his "dirty political work at Camberne?"

THE PILLORY.

While all other parties regard election campaigns as a nuisance... we revolutionary Social Democrats enjoy the opportunity of fighting the enemies of the proletariat.

Justice, 13.1.06.

We should never have thought of contesting (the Southampton Election) but for the undertaking voluntarily made by the Liberals with the Trades Council only to run one Candidate.

Justice, 20.1.06.

So that if the undertaking had not been made, the S.D.F. would have denied themselves the enjoyment of fighting the Liberal enemy of the proletariat. There's self-sacrifice for you!

"Williams and Gribble fought well and Jack in particular was gaining in popularity every day... So far as the calculations of those who are supposed to be excellent judges of elections went our chances were exceedingly favourable." Yet—

"Something went wrong with the works of the voting machine however, and just at the critical time a considerable portion of our people must have given their favours to the Liberals."

Northampton S.D.F. Rept. Justice, 20.1.06.

The popularity of picturesque personalities is a poor thing to build up a working-class party upon. Anyhow, it was not strong enough to prevent a considerable portion of our people from falling from grace. Moral.—Build always upon the rock of Socialism and your people will never fail you.

To us the chief value of the present contest is educational; and that is why our interest is virtually centered in the small band of uncompromising avowed Socialists... It is because of our deep-seated and long held conviction of the utter hopelessness of anything short of open and implacable warfare against party and privilege and capitalism that...

Clarion, 12.1.06.

Anything short of open and implacable warfare against capitalism is utterly hopeless. Therefore, we should abstain from voting except for Independent Labour Candidates. Yet not one of the independent Labour Candidates is either an avowed uncompromising Socialist or at open and implacable war with Capitalism. Therefore, they are utterly hopeless. Dear! dear! And this is a clarion call.

London, long-suffering, patient London, has made a wonderfully clean sweep of its ruck of ground landlords, contractors, gas and water shareholders, electric trust candidates and municipal reactionaries generally.

S.D.S., Labour Leader, 19.1.06.

The main part of their (the Liberals' and Tories') business is to mislead the people. They find out what questions are most likely to excite the prejudices and appeal to the passions of the mob and then play upon them... They are bound to be found out, but they are buoyed up with the hope that when that time comes some other question will arise. If not then the worst that can befall is the defeat of their party, and their rents and profits and legal fees will be quite as secure as before.

J.K.H., Labour Leader, 12.1.06.

One of the faults of the young men who write for the "Labour Leader" is that they think their own contributions are the only things of value in the paper and never read the other fellows' stuff. Now if S.D.S. had but read J.K.H. the week previously when J.K.H. for some unexplained cause happened to be writing sense, he might have avoided making such a dismal exhibition of himself.

The significant feature of the elections so far is the big vote polled by the Socialist and Labour candidates who were run independent of both capitalist factions.

Why this falling off in the big vote? Is it because the Camberne Candidature was not independent of both Capitalist factions? Is it because it was dependent upon one of the Capitalist Factions? Who said Tory gold?

ELECTION RESULT.	
	Camberne.
Dunn (L.)	4,614
Hewitt (C)	2,384
J. JONES (S.D.F.)	109

PARTY NOTES.

The Bexley and District Branch has been officially formed and commenced its public career on January 17, when J. Kent delivered a lecture under its auspices at Coverdale Hall, Bexley Heath.

Similar meetings will be held on the 3rd Wednesday in each month, the speaker for the present month being A. Anderson.

In the Summer a vigorous campaign will be conducted, the Broadway, Bexley Heath, being an almost ideal spot for open air meetings.

The arrangements for the debate between our Comrade Fitzgerald and Mr. Doody, representing the Southend Branch of the Social Democratic Federation, are being proceeded with. It is expected to take place some time this month or early next.

The statement which appeared in several Tory papers to the effect that one of Mr. Shirley Benn's nomination papers was signed by the Secretary of our Battersea Branch was untrue. This is what happened. W. E. Clarke was met by an agent of Mr. Benn's and induced "on the spur of the moment," as he regretfully admits, to sign a nomination paper. At the following meeting of the Battersea Branch (Jan. 15) Clarke was, of course, expelled.

We are sorry to lose any member, but in such matters as these, prompt action is absolutely necessary. No distinction can be drawn between one who thoughtlessly and one who deliberately departs from the straight line of conduct which we of the S.P.G.B. have mapped out as the only one that can be safely and successfully pursued by the working-class if they are to work out their own emancipation. All the time, our class must "wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist."

H. B. Holding, a Tottenham Fabian, has agreed to debate with our Comrade Anderson "after the election." The arrangements are being made by the North London District Council.

Peckham Branch held a good "No Vote" meeting at Deptford Broadway on Sunday the 14th Jan., despite the attempts of local S.D.F. members, who were supporting Alderman Bowerman, to "hustle" them.

Romford Division, with the aid of Comrade A. Anderson, also held a good "No Vote" meeting on Wednesday the 17th Jan. at Barking Broadway.

It is not true, as has been asserted, that Mr. E. E. Hunter has become a member of the S.P.G.B. He has returned to the S.D.F. fold, through the Stratford Branch of that body.

Our General Election Manifesto was well distributed and has been the means of bringing the Party before the notice of a number of persons, who have since written us for further information. No doubt practical results will follow in the near future.

By arrangement between the West and South West London Branches a Social Evening will be held at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, to-morrow, February 4th. The proceeds will be devoted to the general funds of the Party.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary.

THE NEW 'FORCE' IN POLITICS.

So! We are, it seems, to rejoice in the advent of a new force in English politics. We are to observe "the descent of a bolt out of the blue" and be happy. We are to note that "Labour" no longer sits on the "doorstep" but is inside the House of Commons and will do things. We are even to accept the fact as a sign of victory for Socialism! Well! This is interesting. Because in our ignorance we thought this sort of "Labour" force descended from the blue, or, to be more accurate, ascended from the black, very many moons since. We seemed to have recollections even of a "Labour" minister in a Liberal administration before Mr. Burns. It is true these old-time "Labour" representatives received the support of the Liberal Party. True also that the Rt. Hon. Thomas Burt was for very good reasons *persona grata* with Liberalism. But then so also was and is Mr. Burns, the chairman of the "Labour" group in the last parliament. And it is not the undisputable fact that with few exceptions, the present "Labour" members were the unofficial candidates of the Liberal Party and were backed by most of the local Liberal associations? Then why should we rejoice?

WEIGHED IN THE BALANCES.

What if this sort of "Labour" representation has got inside the House of Commons in rather larger force than usual (which we suppose is what our enthusiastic exhorters mean when they call upon us to be glad)—what then? Have they some greater power behind them by which they will be capable of performing greater deeds than their predecessors? What power? Are they not the nominees of an organisation whose members have not reached that stage of political development wherein they can dissociate their interests from the interests of the capitalist political factions? Are not these "Labour" members' wages therefore dependent upon the manner in which they approach the measures introduced by the capitalist parties? Can they freely attack these measures and the parties introducing them and be sure that their action will not be misunderstood by those who pay the piper? If so, what becomes of the argument in favour of the strict independence of the L.R.C. candidates on the ground that if they were associated with the Liberal Party (for example) the Tory members of the L.R.C. would break away? If not, are they not obliged to give their support to capitalist legislation (unless, of course, that legislation is so glaringly anti-Labour that even the members of the L.R.C. could appreciate it) for fear the contrary action would be misunderstood? Are they not for the same reason forced to proceed with exceeding circumspection in their endeavours to induce the capitalist government to adopt measures they (the capitalist government) do not desire to adopt?

FOUR SO WAITING.

Is it not the fact that the majority of these "Labour" representatives are themselves, in everything but name, Liberals, and, not understanding the reason for the position of the working class, cannot act as champions of working-class interests? And is it not undeniable that those who do profess to understand, and who at other times are prepared to call themselves Socialists, have repeatedly obscured their Socialism in order to secure the position (as when they stood for election) and confused the minds of those whose intellectual clarity they are supposed to desire, by associating themselves with the representatives of capitalism for capitalist objects? Then what can be expected from these more than their predecessors? What is the use of their separate party and separate whips? Where is the utility of their distinctive label? The fact is that nine out of ten of them have been elected in alliance with the Liberals; they are paid by an organisation overwhelmingly Liberal, and they are expected to act, as Crooks and Shackleton and Henderson, and in a slightly modified manner, Hardie, have all along acted Liberal. The man who expects more from them is likely to be disappointed; the man who regards their return as a victory

for Socialism simply doesn't know what he is talking about.

WHY THE "LABOUR" MEN WILL NOT DO.

Our position is that these men, whatever their intentions, are actually retarding the development of the only organisation of the working class that can enter into effective conflict with the forces of capitalism, because they obscure the fact that this conflict exists *always* in industrial affairs, and do not insist that it must be waged upon the political plane also. By association with capitalist representatives in both political and economic affairs they induce the idea (which capitalism does everything possible to foster) that the hostility does not exist, yet until that fact is grappled with and clearly understood there can be no material improvement in the workers' condition. It is unfortunate, of course, that the workers do not understand. It makes the task of those who are concerned with the overthrow of capitalism, and the emancipation of the working class from wage-slavery, very difficult. The results of their work seem so very slow a-coming. And some of them tire and drop out of the movement, and others—the Irvings and the McNabs of the S.D.F. for example—curse the stupidity of the working class, while others again—the Hyndmans and Quelches and Hardies and the rest—wary of the work, endeavour to secure some immediate consolation by pandering to the ignorance they once may have sought to dispel, and so simply increase the difficulties in the way.

THE IRRECONCILABLE FEW.

Only the few remain in the forefront of the fight, waging unceasing battle for their class. These are they who, belonging themselves to the working class, have been at pains to obtain information as to the causes of the ignorance of their fellows; who have seen how, for generation after generation they have been oppressed and misled, sent off upon a barren quest by one set of supposed friends, confused by the actions and instruction of another set; now buoyed up with hope of happiness, now plunged into the apathy of disappointment and despair. Knowing these things the few set out with no delusions upon the score of the reception their propaganda will receive at the hands of their class, and are not downcast and peevish when the results desired fail to materialise as quickly as they wish.

We of The Socialist Party of Great Britain are of this few. Our mission is simple. We have to proceed with our educational propaganda until the working class have understood the fundamental facts of their position—the facts that because they do not own the means by which they live they are commodities on the market, never bought unless the buyers (the owners of the means of life) can see a profit to themselves in the transaction, always sold when the opportunity offers because in that only can the necessities of life be obtained. We have to emphasise the fact that no appreciable change is possible in the working-class condition while they remain commodities, and that the only method by which the alteration can be wrought is by the working class taking the means of life out of the hands of those who at present hold them, and whose private ownership is the cause of the trouble. Before this can occur the workers will have to understand the inevitable opposition of interests between them and the capitalist class, who, because of their ownership of the means of life, are able to exploit them, so that they will not make the mistake of voting into power, as they have always done hitherto, the representatives of the interests of those owning the means of life, because those who dominate political power dominate also the armed forces that keep the working class in subjection.

THE JUSTIFICATION OF HOSTILITY.

Therefore are we in opposition to all other political parties, holding on irrefutable evidence, that these other parties are confusing what must be clear to working-class minds before a change can be effected. This is our mission, and we shall conduct it with all the energy we have at our command. We know that the row that we have to hoe is likely to be a long one. That does not frighten us because we know that were the row twice as long it would have to be hoed. There is no dodging the duty. There are no short cuts. Naturally, however, we wish the

work to be covered as soon as possible, and that is why we oppose and expose those gentlemen who, sometimes with the best of intentions, blur the issue that must be kept unblurred, and so prolong our labours.

That is our position. If it contains flaws we shall be glad to hear of them. Meanwhile we regret that the entrance of the "Labour" men into the best club in Europe is not a Socialist victory and cannot be a Labour triumph. Meanwhile also, those who thought that the entrance of Burns into ministerial position would result in administration to the advantage of the unemployed should note that the Local Government Board has refused to sanction that portion of the loan applied for from Tottenham which was intended to meet the difference between the cost of work performed by a contractor and its cost if executed by the local unemployed. And those who thought that the advent of a new Liberal administration implied a large-hearted and sympathetic Labour policy should observe that sixty men have been sent to prison for five days each, and fifteen to one month each, for taking up collections in the street during unemployed demonstrations. A.J.M.G.

THE LAND OF THE FREE!

A dispatch from Dayton, O., reports that 300 employees of the National Cash Register Co. were discharged because they failed to attend a meeting to listen to addresses on the labour situation by the company officials. The meeting was called by the company because of its decision to refuse the demands of the Typographical union for an eight-hour day. This is the concern which advertises itself as the "model employer of labor," because it furnishes bath towels, pocket-handkerchiefs and hair curlers to its employees. In return for these kindnesses the company exacts complete obedience from its slaves, as shown above. This only makes clear again that the capitalists will grant everything (even higher wages sometimes), but freedom to the workers, for with freedom will come an end of exploitation. The capitalists are dictators because they own the tools with which the workers must earn a livelihood. When the workers own the tools the despotism of capitalism will cease, and only then.

A RASH PROMISE.

I do not pretend to accept as gospel the principles you have laid down. If, however, any practical proposal (on unemployment) came before the Cabinet from Mr. John Burns or anyone else, no one would be more eager TO LISTEN—than I. JOHN MORLEY.

It is particularly requested that all communications be addressed: "The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 1a, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N." See official notice on page 4.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

HOT POLLOI.—Thanks for contribution. We regret that the pressure of important matter upon our very limited space prevents us giving it a place in our columns.

P. LAMB (Chelsea).—There is no truth in the rumour that E. E. Hunter, late London Organiser of the S.P.G.B., has joined our ranks. We understand, on the contrary, that he has returned to the fold from which he was expelled some time ago—the S.D.F., to wit.

VOL. I.

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Well bound in stiff boards.

Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be sent to Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1a, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

Printed by Jacomb Bros., 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 1a, Caledonian Rd., London, N.

S.P.G.B. North London District Council.

LECTURES FOR FEBRUARY.

DOVECOTE HALL, :-

78, High Road, Wood Green, at 7.30.

Feb. 4th—T. A. JACKSON:

"Reform or Revolution."

11th—C. LEHANE;

Subject to be announced.

18th—F. C. WATTS:

"Socialism and the Struggle for Existence."

25th—J. E. DAWKINS:

Subject to be announced.

DISCUSSION.

ADMISSION FREE.

S. P. G. B. BATTERSEA BRANCH.

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

WILL BE GIVEN AT

SYDNEY HALL

38, YORK ROAD, BATTERSEA,
AS UNDER:-

Feb. 4th—SOCIAL & REUNION.

11th—A. ANDERSON:

Subject to be announced.

18th—R. H. KENT:

"Human Possibilities."

25th—J. KENT:

"Which is the Party of Labour?"

Chair at 7.30 sharp.

Discussion.

ADMISSION FREE.

ECONOMIC CLASSES

Will be held Sundays Feb. 11 and 25 at 3 p.m.

Instructor - J. FITZGERALD.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 1.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN,

Containing, in full detail, a statement of the

Principles, Policy, & Rules

OF THE PARTY.

Post free, 1 copy, 1d.; 6 copies, 5d.; 12 copies, 9d. Special terms for larger quantities. Orders and remittances should be forwarded to the Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1a, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

1a, CALEDONIAN RD., KING'S CROSS, LONDON, N.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

BEXLEY & DISTRICT.—R. A. V. Morris, Sec., Oxshot, Warren Rd., Bexley Heath. Branch meets 1st, 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at Sec's House at 8. Public Lectures 3rd Wednesdays at Coverdale Hall, Bexley Heath, 8.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmingon Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmingon Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—G. Wilson, Sec., 14, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets every Saturday at 8.30 at above address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 309, North End Road, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—T. Bennett, Sec., 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Tuesdays at 8.30 at the Co-op. Stores, 79, Grove Rd., Holloway.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8 o'clock at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in month at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—J. G. Graver, Sec., 52, Frith Road, Leytonstone. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Comrades desiring to acquire or sell books on Social Science, etc. (new or second-hand), should send particulars to the Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1a, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., from whom the undermentioned unsoiled works may be obtained at prices stated.

CAPITAL.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION.

By KARL MARX.

(Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR.

By PROF. J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.

(New Edition, Revised, Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY.

A STUDY OF TOWN LIFE.

By B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

(Illustrated by Folding Maps, Diagrams, &c.)

(Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 4s. 6d.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 19. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, MARCH, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action, determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Readers who can endorse the foregoing in its entirety are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the nearest Branch or with the General Secretary. See Directory, page 8.

PAUPERISM VERSUS POVERTY.

The Rt. Hon. John Burns, in the picturesque language characteristic of him, once said "Figures never lie, but liars sometimes figure." During the late election, however, in contradicting the figures of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, Mr. Burns did a little figuring of his own.

He said "In 1849, when the country had just emerged from Protection, there were 1,088,000 paupers, or 62 per thousand of the population, in 1900 there were 25 per thousand. In 1849 the able-bodied poor numbered 13 per thousand of the population, but to-day only 2 per thousand and of the paupers were able-bodied."

"As to the cost of the Poor Law Administration, the increase was due to the fact that as under Protection the standard of comfort of the whole community was low, so under Free Trade it was correspondingly better. They had better workhouses, many of them almost palatial where as formerly they were almost a cross between a penitentiary and a prison." The italics are ours.

That the standard of comfort of a section of the community has improved is, of course, true; but this cannot be said of the mass of the workers. They toil harder and can buy no more with their wages. Their employment is less secure and their out-of-work spells are longer. The average worker's wage is barely sufficient to enable him to continue in working condition and reproduce his kind; whilst there are 12 to 13 millions of the working class who cannot obtain even that bare sufficiency. This too, in face of the fact that the labour of the people has increased the wealth of the "country" by leaps and bounds.

We have, it is true, if we have the misfortune to outlive our usefulness to our masters, permission to end our days in those palatial residences which Mr. Burns said are due to Free Trade.

But what of Mr. Burns' figures?

They only show an increase in well-being if the Poor Law administration has not been made more severe. Let us see whether the Poor Law regulations have been made stricter, for if they have, the veriest tyro would know that the value of the figures is thereby destroyed.

The Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 abolished the grant of relief in aid of wages, and considerably modified the Act of Settlement, it also laid down the principle of the Workhouse Test. Parliament, however, left the gradual introduction of the principle in the hands of the Central Department. Nevertheless the refusal of relief in aid of wages and the partial imposition of the workhouse test in order to discourage applicants for relief caused a continuous decline in pauperism from 1834—twelve years before the inauguration of Free Trade.

The Poor Law was further strengthened by the Amendment Act of 1841; but it was not (says the "Encyclopædia Britannica") until 1867 that the local administrative bodies took the matter up with much enthusiasm. The Pauper Inmate Act of 1871, and the Casual Poor Act of 1882 made conditions of relief more onerous by increasing the compulsory stay of vagrants and by other means.

Regarding this, Asherott and Preston Thomas say in their work, "The English Poor Law System," p. 285, "The marked increase of indoor paupers (accompanied, of course, by a still more marked decrease of outdoor paupers until

recently is due to the movement beginning about 1865 in favour of the workhouse principle."

Again, p. 288, "It is clear that in the case of this class of paupers able-bodied adults, it was mainly by the rigid enforcement of the workhouse test that this improvement was secured."

The facts clearly show that the statistics of pauperism for the past 70 years are in themselves no guide to the condition of the working class, but they illustrate that poverty is inseparable from capitalism, be it Free Trade or Protectionist. Indeed, in defiance of tests and restrictions there has been a marked increase in pauperism during the past decade.

In spite of Mr. Burns, decreasing pauperism has not been due to diminishing poverty, but to the application of the golden rule of capitalist poor "relief," to give the poor exactly what they don't want, so that they would rather starve than come again.

It is, indeed, in consistent application of this golden rule that Mr. Burns himself is being used. The fact that he provides an excellent means of deceiving some with vague labour aspirations into the toils of Liberalism, is not the only merit he possesses in capitalist eyes. Few have made it more peculiarly their business to dilate upon those virtues which the capitalist desires in his wage-slaves that they may work cheaper and harder, and none have so vehemently championed the capitalist view of the poor as the new "Labour" minister.

No course moreover, leads so easily to popularity and patronage as the flagellation of working-class vices, provided always the fact is blunked that these are the product of a vicious system. Nothing wins the applause of the interested and the superficial more easily than the loud-mouthed opprobrium of the loafer, the outcast and the unfortunate, so long as attention is diverted from the condition of things that created them. Mr. Burns has repeatedly disclaimed any sympathy for these victims of the capitalist juggernaut. He has "none to spare" for these. Even the "Pall Mall Gazette" was led to exclaim that he might be trusted to deal with the "whining wretches" known as the unemployed.

In the "Charity Organization Review" he said in 1891 and repeats it in varying phrases, "Every man who has been out of work cheers the man who is in favour of out-door relief. Every loafer at the street corner who lives on it says: 'Three cheers for a pound a week out-relief.' I have always been against it except when administered with the greatest rigidity."

No wonder, therefore, that the capitalist press proclaim him as the "Right man in the right place," for as President of the Local Government Board he has found his vocation in the administration of the Poor Law in the interests of the master class.

We who know the utter futility of charity, know also that the only hope of the working class lies in Socialism, and, therefore, concentrate our efforts on that, necessarily in hostility to the capitalist class and all who become its willing tools. The interests of the master class demand that the Poor Law shall be administered with the "greatest rigidity," so that the poor may be compelled to submit to the most inhuman conditions rather than accept its "shelter." And the ruling class have found a man after their own heart, one also who does not shrink, when juggling with their statistics, from conceding awkward facts. F.C.W.

SOCIALISM.

WHAT IT IS AND THE CONDITIONS OF ITS REALISATION.

In spite of the arduous years of propaganda—or perhaps because of them—of Socialist ideas and Socialist thought there exists an immense amount of ignorance of what Socialism really implies. Constantly during the last few weeks of political strife I have met with "Socialists" who have had not even the remotest idea of what really constituted Socialism; "Socialists" whose entire end and aim was the taxation of ground values; "Socialists" who saw in Tariff Reform and a general support of Tory candidates, the surest method of furthering their ends; "Socialists" who recognised that politics was all a farce, but must need canvass for Liberal Candidates; members of "Socialist" organisations who ran as "Labour" candidates, and members of "Socialist" organisations who ran as Liberal candidates; "Socialists" of the S.D.F. and the I.L.P., of the Fabian Society and the Guild of St. Matthew: such were and are some of the causes of the confusion of what Socialism really is which exists among the working class to-day.

What these men cannot see is that for a rapid acceptance of Socialist principles a clear expression of those principles is required. The believer in Socialism must go to the working class and tell them the underlying ideas of Socialism; must show them that Socialism is a distinct political and economic aspiration, capable of being explained in a manner at once brief, clear, and lucid, and remarkably fitted for practical adaptation to present-day needs; must show that as the Liberal works for Liberalism, the Tory for Toryism, and the capitalist for his own individual gain, so too must the Socialist work only for Socialism, must support those candidates only who are pledged to Socialism and run as avowed Socialists on a Socialist platform, and so must the working class work in its own class interest.

To do this, however, clear thinking is expedient and, alas! the gentry who form the membership of such bodies as the S.D.F., I.L.P., and the Fabian Society are seldom guilty of thinking clearly where the subject matter of their thought is Socialism.

I am forced to these remarks by the astounding spectacle which has been witnessed during the recent change in the personnel of our government bureaucracy. Men of all shades of "Socialist" opinion have been carried off their feet, and have been found openly and avowedly supporting the candidature of members of that party "which is in no sense more likely to do anything for the working class than is the Tory Party."

One thing stands out clearly in the mind of the average worker, and that is that any "Socialist" who works for Liberalism or Toryism or in aid of the candidature of any member of either of the capitalist parties, might as well not be a Socialist for all the practical good he is to the Socialist movement. To those of us who are members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, who have never in any measure compromised our Socialism, they stand condemned as not merely useless to the Socialist movement, but a constant and increasing danger to it.

With every fresh day comes a furthering of the industrial development of capitalism, comes the hastening of that perfection of the capitalist system which means its downfall. It therefore behoves each and all of us who have the cause of Socialism at heart to avoid any confusing of the issues in the minds of those whose suffrage we seek. And this can only be done by keeping aloof from any party, movement, or tendency which is not clearly Socialist.

The real reason why the members of the S.D.F. and the similarly constituted I.L.P. are not clear as to their methods of realising their avowed ideal is that they have never clearly grasped the meaning of what constitutes the class struggle. A lip homage they have given, and nothing more. A nominal adherence to the teaching of Marx they give, but a clear knowledge of Marx's teaching they have not. Having failed to base their political policy upon the sound principle of the class struggle they have

been at the mercy of every political current and thus, failing to understand their own position, they have failed to make others understand it.

We are all agreed that the ultimate end of Socialist propaganda must be the establishment of a Socialist regime through the common holding and common control of all the products of labour. This is to be secured by wresting the means and instruments of production and distribution from the possession of the present holders and utilising them for the common good.

To secure this end it is, of course, necessary that a very large proportion of the people must be in favour of the change, whereas to-day a very minute proportion of the people of this country are thus favourable. Hence it is necessary to propagate our principles in such a manner as to induce their acceptance by those who are now hostile or indifferent to them.

To ensure such a change of opinion it is essential that the differences between the Socialist position and every other position should be emphasised rather than minimised. We are something more than merely advanced radicals, something more than Co-operators seeking co-operation in distribution. These latter are seeking to palliate present day conditions while conserving the present industrial basis of Society, whereas we strive to revolutionise the entire structure of Society by changing its economic basis. We are qualitatively as well as quantitatively diverse from every other political organisation.

At the same time that the preaching of our ideal is necessary we are fully aware that we have the economic forces of industrial capitalism ranged on our side, helping us to fight our battle for Socialism. The enforced introduction of improved machinery, through the operation of free competition; the development of a complicated credit system; the lessening of distance between manufactory and market owing to the betterment of means of communication; the internationalisation of industry and trade: these among other causes lead directly to the throwing of men and women out of employment; more frequently occurring trade crises; and monopolies with their control of wages, prices, and the government of the nations.

All these economic changes, while making life more insecure as wealth increases, generate a seething mass of discontent which the Socialist must organise and educate. So, too, the changes towards monopoly are changes in the direction of greater social co-operation among the workers: a co-operation which leads to a constant interchange of ideas. Again, under the monopoly an entire industry is often worked by one organisation for the capitalist's private gain, whereas the worker is being taught to see that it might as easily be worked in the interests of the entire community.

It is needful, then, to understand that Socialism is a change from capitalist individual ownership to common social ownership, that the believers in this change must combine in an organisation for educational and political purposes so as to engineer the capture of the political machinery as a preliminary to taking over the economic.

Unfortunately the acceptance of the principle of common holding and common control of the instruments of wealth making does not involve the recognition of the necessity of forming a political organisation absolutely independent of every other. It is so very tempting to think that perhaps something may be done now by utilising the present political parties. Many men, indeed, have thought that they could permeate one or the other of the two political parties with Socialist ideas. Bernard Shaw and his Fabian Society have endeavoured to secure the Liberals while Maitland Barry has made a similar attempt with the Tories. All such endeavours have failed as they were bound to fail. The political divisions are along class lines. The reason why to-day the lines of demarcation between Liberal and Tory are fading is because the two elements of the capitalist class are fast merging. The aristocratic landed class no longer exist as a separate class from the moneyed capitalist class. Money weeds with title and divisions are blotted out. Not so with the working class. Here the line of demarcation is exceedingly clear and the economic division of class must evolve and be reflected in the capitalist division of party.

Marx, in his famous "Communist Manifesto,"

contends—and rightly so—that all history is a history of class struggles. Not only this, but the political power in modern nations is being constantly wrested from the hands of prerogative by a class economically inferior which absorbs the class economically higher.

Thus in this country the last century saw the political power taken possession of by the moneyed capitalist class, and the dispossession of the titled landed aristocracy who formerly held it. This new class, with its pride of position, drew towards it the former ruling class, with whom it has gradually merged its identity. They twain have become as one flesh.

Over against this new composite ruling class is the working class, which is slowly asserting itself as an economic and political class. The struggle of to-morrow is between capitalist class and working class, and as the latter is numerically much stronger than the former, and being more in touch with the realities of production possess men of stronger brains and brighter intellects, there is no doubt as to who will ultimately prove the victor in the struggle.

The worker must win, and in his winning will absorb the capitalist class in his ranks, thus procuring by his political emancipation the final abolition of all class. But this abolition of class can only arise through the removing of all class advantage and class privilege. And the removal of these mean the identification of all wealth as social wealth—the abolition of all private holding of commodities. Thus it is plain that the final political and economic emancipation of the working class can only arise from the establishing of a Socialist Society.

The deduction I wish to draw from this is that an independent working-class party may start with whatever views it likes, but it must ultimately adopt and fight its battles on a Socialist platform. Its destiny must be to work along the same lines as The Socialist Party of Great Britain—lines of uncompromising Socialism.

ECONOMICS.

GOD'S REFUGE FOR POOR PEOPLE.

In view of the attempts to "monkey with the thermometer" of the labour market by the transportation for life as it is hoped of a selected few of the unemployed and their dependents to the 160 acres of man-less land which a benevolent Canadian Government (of capitalists in need of a larger surplus of labour themselves) have set apart for each landless man who can conform to the conditions of the 10 dollar gift, the following extracts from a letter received by a comrade from a friend "in our great self-governing colony" will prove of considerable interest. Their publication may do something to counteract the work of the emigration touts (religious and secular) and the great-hearted philanthropists who are ready and even anxious to sink their hard-earned savings in a fund designed to provide for some of the deserving poor a way out of their unfortunate condition (and out of the country) to a home beyond the sea pending translation to "the home beyond the sky" also arranged, we understand, mainly for the reception of the deserving poor. On the evidence we incline to the belief that the latter is very little, if any, more intangible than the former.

WINNIPEG.

Jan. 30th, '06.

Dear Comrade, I feel that I must give you my views of Canada as this country is just now receiving so much attention in England. . . . The conditions of labour are cruel. The workman is exploited if anything even worse than in England. At the present time there are hundreds of unemployed in this town. Every morning great numbers of men unable to purchase a paper, can be seen making for the "Free Press" office (outside which particulars of situations vacant are displayed) in the hope that something may be going. The cold is very intense and plenty of people are without the clothes necessary to keep them warm, while, although there are large tracts of forest, fires for them are out of the question owing to the high price of wood. Six dollars (£1 1s. 6d.) is the cost of a single case of wood, which is accounted for by the fact that there is only one way of getting it here,

viz. by the Canadian Pacific Railway, who have, therefore, a complete hold of the place and charge very high rates of carriage.

The price of most other things is proportionally high—five cents for a 1½ lb loaf (12 ozs. to the lb.); housing accommodation that would cost 6 or 7 shillings in England costs 15 dollars (18s.); the lowest tram fare is 5 cents (2½d.); clothing is very much dearer and altogether I estimate that I have to pay a dollar for what could be bought at home for a shilling.

The winter here begins in September and has often not broken up until April, and as the majority of men are thrown out of work during that time, they have to face poverty pretty bare. Just for the few summer months there is plenty of work, but as I say it does not last long. I have met men who have been in the Colony for 20 years and are as far from that big fortune the emigration monger is always talking about as they ever were. Even men with money find the struggle against the large companies too hard and only recently four fairly large business houses went smash in less than a fortnight.

To-day I was at the station when a large number of immigrants arrived from England and it was enough to make one's heart bleed. What chance do these poor wretches stand in a strange land when so many knowing all the ins and outs of the place cannot get anything to do? The Home Missions have been fined for over-crowding their doss-houses. They charge the out-of-works 10 cents for a bed—such as it is.

All "pubs" and hotel bars close at 8 o'clock and on Saturdays at 6 o'clock remaining shut until 10 a.m. Monday, so that the opportunities for the workers to spend their money (when they have any) in drink are not very extensive.

As a further instance of the state of the labour market, I may say that I was in conversation to-night with a contractor who is putting up a large building by the City Hall and he told me he had 75 men, some of them with the very best references, call to-day looking for work. He could give them nothing being full up. Of course the employers encourage immigration schemes. They want plenty of men in the labour market during the busy summer months so that they may not have to pay the comparatively high prices for labour which were necessary in the past when labour was scarce.

Immigration is good business for Shipping and Railway Companies and the Employers, but the poor propertyless immigrant finds himself between the devil and the deep sea. Those 160 acres may be all right for the man with capital, but when one has no money to buy implements and seed and the oxen for ploughing and the other things necessary, and when one remembers that the land (for which the Government charge 10 dollars) may be, and frequently is, located 40 or 50 miles back from a railway or even a small town where crops can be marketed, it is no great capture.

It is not surprising, therefore, that according to the figures published by the "Free Press" the other night, only 27 in every hundred homesteads taken are held long enough to secure the patent. This patent is the title deed which the Government gives after the individual has been living on and cultivating his land for 3 years. But in order to get it he has to cultivate 10 acres at least every year or the plot is taken away from him and sold to the next comer at 20 dollars—the price advancing 10 dollars for every new-comer.

The foolishness of some of the immigrants is surprising. They expect to find a house and everything necessary awaiting them. But they soon discover their mistake and many of them beat a hasty retreat very quickly. Numbers of the men who are walking about Winnipeg without a cent in the world have returned from Homesteads up West. Many of them would gladly go back to England if they could, for however hard their lot was there it was not so hard as it is here. But as they can't raise the money they have to stop and make the best of it. You should read some of the complimentary remarks about General Booth and his organisation which these miserable folk have written on the walls of the Salvation Army Immigration Hall. You would be amused but you would also be able to see that the writers were far from content.

I hope to be back again in England soon myself. This "Heaven for the poor" is more like Hell with the fire out! Yours truly, E.F.

SOME PUBLICATIONS.

RICHES AND POVERTY, by L. C. Chiozza Money, 5 - BEIT.

A valuable book. A very valuable book up to a point. A most effective arrangement of startling figures. An armoury of facts for the propagandist. Facts which the Socialist can use to most excellent purpose. A really splendid compilation of comparative tables so clearly set out that the wayfaring man, though a fool, can see he is being robbed. But the wayfaring man will not see the figures unless they are extracted for him and reproduced in some cheaper publication. The book is too dear.

That is the first criticism we have to offer. Its price puts it out of the range of the possibilities of the purse of that portion of the proletariat who purchase such publications for perusal.

The second criticism is that the book is only valuable up to a point. That point is reached where the tables leave off. After that point the book is still interesting, as showing how close a man can sail to the Socialist position without being forced to concede that nothing short of Socialism can suffice to effect that change in the distribution of wealth which Mr. Money desires; as shewing how a man may cut the ground clean from under him and yet proceed apparently indifferent to the fact that he is dancing upon nothing. Mr. Money's work frequently conveys the same impression. It is as though he sets out with the best of intentions determined that he will not again be balked in his purpose; determined to argue his case logically from effect to cause and to put his findings upon record, only to find that a something or somebody lies in wait within that radius which marks the utmost limit of the area over which the capitalist scribe may operate, to prevent his further advance and by the exercise of a power against which he has never apparently prevailed, to turn him back by a painfully circuitous course to the point from which he started. What that something is may be a matter of conjecture to some. Those unfamiliar with his work might ascribe it to Mr. Money's lack of knowledge. But we do not share that view. Whatever else it may be it is not ignorance. But it is always successful in its endeavours to head Mr. Money off.

And so it comes about that having compiled valuable data for the Socialist, having given an excellent summary of the national balance sheet and, which is almost equally valuable, shewn how he has arrived at his figures for the different items, having formulated an unanswerable indictment of the present system and made quite clear by inference that the system is absolutely rotten at its base and that things as they are can only be materially improved by the destruction of the foundations and the erection of an entirely new social edifice upon a new foundation, having done this he peters out in a recital of petty-fogging and miserably inadequate proposals, none of which go down to root causes and all of which when realised would, therefore, hardly make any appreciable impression upon the problems they were designed to solve.

The consideration of these proposals occupy one half the book. They are not valuable suggestions. They are not new. They may all be found in the programmes of the many reform organisations whose existence and whose work operate so disastrously to the confusion of the working-class mind. Our concern is for a clear working-class mind. The working class must understand their position and the reasons why that position is so hazardous and unhappy. Because the emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class themselves. And if they are inveigled into the belief that Mr. Money's "remedial" measures matter, they are led into a mental bog from which they must extricate themselves before they can organise their strength for the overthrow of the system which causes their misery. While they are doing that they are wasting time and expending their force uselessly.

Therefore, while gladly admitting the value of Mr. Money's statistics, we consider the last half of his work highly mischievous. He should issue it in two volumes—the statistical part for

sale at a few pence; the other part at a few pounds. We make him a present of the suggestion and hope he will act upon it.

"AN UNAUTHORISED PROGRAMME" and "POVERTY," by R. J. Derfel (Manchester), each 2d. Two pamphlets designed to shew that Trade Unionists, Co-operators, Labour Representatives and Socialists—particularly Socialists—are all more or less right in their conceptions of the causes of poverty and all more or less wrong (generally more) in the methods they adopt to effect a change. Socialism alone, the author holds, will guarantee the poor against the misery of their present condition, but they will never understand that until Socialists organize Labour to do something that will bring some immediate benefit to them (the workers).

It seems there's far too much talking at present and not enough doing.

This should, says Mr. Derfel, be at once remedied. The first thing is to do—more talking! We should have a world convention of all religions and churches, reformers, philanthropists, Socialists and all professions and interests. This is bound to do good. Thereafter we should form societies to provide coals, clothing, milk, food, houses, and, yes, and funerals particularly we presume funerals. Under this soup and blanket treatment the workers will awake and abolish the philanthropists, etc., etc., etc., and poverty will be no more. As it is "things are getting worse instead of better. Monopolists are not satisfied with joining house to house, they join town to town and country to country in their eager desire to grab all for themselves. . . . The churches with scarcely an exception are on the side of private property and privilege. Government and law supported by all their servants from the hum to the judge and defended by the Police and the Army and Navy, are under the control and at the command of the upper classes. . . . Our rulers have always, and still do, make the fullest use of force and compulsion in their own interests and that is why . . . the many are so poor and miserable." Nevertheless "it is not true that the upper classes as a class or that both or either of the political parties as a party are enemies to the workers."

Which of course is very clear. Quite obviously "the upper classes as a class" when they use force and compulsion in their own interests are not doing it in their own interests at all. Not really. They are not the enemies of the workers who keep the workers poor, but the friends! It therefore quite plainly follows that "the mission of Socialism must be for all. It must appeal to every class."

By closely following these lines we shall be able "to abolish poverty without doing an injustice to anyone or leaving a feeling of wrong behind."

"Clearly," says our author, "there is need for patience." There is. We are in need of more of it ourselves.

Certainly we are in danger of losing all we have at present to this pathetic product of Mr. Derfel's muddled thought. When a man sets out as his practical programme (as distinguished from the impractical programmes of all the other folk) the calling together of representatives of all professions and interests to consider ways and means for the abolition of most of the professions and interests represented; when he talks of the necessity for the Socialists' appeal being to all, at the same time what he emphasises the fact that the dominant class are using every force at their command to keep the working class in subjection; when he hopes to abolish poverty without leaving a feeling of wrong behind in face of his argument as to proletarian misery being the outcome of the assertion of what the capitalist class undoubtedly regard as their rights; and when he argues that a people too desperately poor to obtain even the means of sustenance should be encouraged to buy their own houses, he must not be surprised if the normal person fails to raise enthusiasm for Mr. Derfel's patent prescription for the prevention of poverty.

Mr. Derfel seems to have a good heart and the best of intentions, but his thought requires ordering and his studies augmenting.

A. J. M. G.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed:—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 12, Caledonian Rd., London, N. THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month. The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months ... £ s. d.
0 1 6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion ... £ s. d.
0 2 0
Quarter Column do. ... 0 5 6
Half Column do. ... 0 10 0
One Column do. ... 1 0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,



SATURDAY, MARCH 3, 1906.

THE SHOW OPEN.

The Westminster Palace of Varieties is now open and the performance is about to commence. Already the inaugural ceremonies have been held and have passed off without hitch of any sort, the quick-change artistes, sleight-of-handists, lampoonists, thimble-riggers, contortionists, low-comedians, heavy "leads," infant prodigies, double-somersaultists, clowns, pantalons and the rest having been at infinite pains to get their parts off letter perfect. The troupe manager has announced the programme which, however, may not strictly follow the advertised order, and we are now in a position to know the turns that may come on although, of course, we are not able to anticipate all the "business" the artistes may introduce. With some of the programme we, like our fathers before us, are very familiar. "Safe" turns these, which have already come through the heat of controversy and the burden of examination, mellowed but little impaired in the eyes of the average audience who still applaud the "gags" and "wheezes" as though they were all new and novel. For those, however, who, being afflicted with good memories, have not unnaturally wearied of the horrible sameness of the performance, new turns have been introduced, from these great things are expected. It is confidently anticipated that they will prove good draws and secure for the management the continued and extended patronage of the great public. All of them, however, will be found, we think, of the stage stagers, bearing no relation to the real life of the people, and although the audience may respond in a manner gratifying to the Showmen, they will find that there is as little in the new business as there was in the old—that directly it is endeavoured to translate into every-day existence the schemes that look and work out so effectively in the parliamentary story they will be found out as the mere sleight-of-hand tricks they really are. On the stage they seem real enough. Off the stage they are tawdry and ludicrous.

AN AFFECTING "TURN."

The great feature of the show we understand from the theatrical Press is to be "Social Reform"—"Revolutionary Reform" as one paper described it. The management simply palpates with "Social Reform." The whole Company will concentrate upon "Social Reform." Indeed,

so pronounced is their "conspicuous zeal for the social question" that "when Mr. G. N. Barnes (of the great L.R.C. combination) had finished his quiet and lucid argument for old age pensions, there was a strong expression of Liberal approval and—O! marvel of marvels!—more than one ministerialist shook Mr. Barnes by the hand!" Surely zeal could no further go—especially when we know the revolutionary extent of Mr. Barnes' reform. He would pay to the deserving worker upon attaining 65 years of age, 5/- five whole shillings without deduction—per week. And the average age of death of the working class is less than one half 65! And 5/- per week as Mr. Barnes may not know (being only a "Labour" troupe) would barely confine the bones of a man within his skin, let alone keep his heart pulsating within him. "It is a disgrace to the head and heart of the nation that agricultural labourers should receive only 14/- or 15/- per week" says Mr. Barnes. "He cannot live upon it." So at a time when he will want a little less hardship and a more expensive form of nourishment, and when he will be unable to augment his income through failing strength, instead of sending him to the workhouse (where his maintenance will cost at least twice as much) we will recognise his services to the State, his many years of arduous endeavour in the building up of the prosperity of the country, by pensioning him with 5/- per week—every week regularly—and let him spend his last days in honourable retirement and comfort—or die like the ungrateful dog he would be and may heaven have mercy on his soul as we have had on his body. O! a zeal for "Social Reform": a great-heart hunger for the well-being of the common people. And many a ministerialist shook Mr. Barnes by the hand for very sympathy and appreciation! It must have been an affecting moment.

THE INAUGURAL CHORUS.

The opening chorus of a Parliamentary Session immediately following a general election if it seldom improves, is always interesting. The members arrive with their blushing honours more thickly upon them than the electoral eggs (rhetorical and other) of their political opponents ever were, and full to the brim with good intentions that generally serve, subsequently, to pave the road to Hell. So that if by any chance they are enabled to vent their oratorical ability upon the King's alleged speech, their savings are likely to be as near as they ever will be to the most advanced views they may treasure in the inmost recesses of their heads. This will apply more particularly to the Labour members who, accustomed, as it is pointed out, to taking the floor in all sorts of gatherings, would not be afflicted with that temptation born we understand of the dignity and grandeur of the "mother of Parliaments" which maketh the heart of the ordinary fledgling to run to water within him. Being, therefore, without the handicap of "nerves," and having an almost unlimited field over which to roam, these Labour candidates (who, by the way, seem to have suddenly been born again as "Socialist" candidates) may be expected to strike out vigorously—or as vigorously as they ever will strike. In these circumstances it is interesting as marking the manner of parliamentarians they are likely to be to note how these advanced "Labour Party" representatives have deported themselves in speech in the most advanced (revolutionary reform) parliament in English History.

SIGNS & PORTENDS.

The case of Mr. Barnes has already been mentioned. He is not likely to set the Thames

afire. Mr. Keir Hardie seems to have been strong on Temperance Reform and against Conscription—but so are quite a number of sober and respectable capitalist members on both sides of the House. Mr. O'Grady will be loyal to his leader—a promise he may find it more difficult to refrain from breaking than he apparently thinks at present. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald (whose bosom, we learn, flamed like unto his chief's with the red tie of *intransigence*) would have the manufacture of volunteer clothing taken away from sweating contractors and given over to the Army (Clothing Department—a sweater's paradise? Mr. Crooks has confined himself so far to interjecting his customary inanities, and the others are waiting for chances. To the "Labour Party" collectively the "King's Speech," which contained of course nothing definite likely to be of value to the working class, was so satisfactory that they decided to move no amendment, while the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress rushed in eagerly with a resolution of gratification and thanks to the Premier. Altogether not a very auspicious commencement. However, as we expected no more we are not so depressed as those who thought the new members would start the fight at the very first opportunity—on the subject of the unemployed who cannot wait without starving, for example. Persons who, professing Socialism with the lip, will reduce it to "Labourism" to secure election, may well be expected to sink their "Labourism" after election to secure a standing. We shall not be astounded, therefore, at anything they may do or not do—unless, indeed, they suddenly awake to the necessity of striking a blow for their class against all the forms and opinions of a capitalist House of Commons. We shall none the less watch their proceedings carefully and report to that portion of the working class we are able to reach.

Meanwhile it is of interest to note that the conditions of the *chinaman* in South Africa which before the election were depicted on every Liberal poster as slavery in its most degrading form, have now become "well fed and well cared for," conditions which the Liberal Government do not at present propose to affect, while to describe such conditions as slavery is "terminological inexactitude." In ordinary everyday language the Liberal election propaganda upon the "Chinese Labour Question" was entirely fraudulent, conducted as we pointed out with the deliberate intention of deceiving the electorate.

OUR SENTIMENTS ALSO.

We never compromise the truth to make a friend, nor withhold a blow at error lest we make an enemy. In firm assurance of final victory, we pursue our course, unworried by weak desire for temporary advantage. We are ever straightforward and outspoken, believing that in fearless independence of action, our integrity of purpose will, in the end, win the respect and confidence of those whom we aim to weld into a class-conscious, aggressive body. Our propaganda is not alone to educate, but also to organise the workers for the conquest of public power, for the complete overthrow of capitalism. Until that mission is accomplished we will stand like a rock, alert and watchful, yielding to nothing. **SNAKE.**

"The Social Revolution," by Karl Kautsky, author of "The Extinction of Petty Enterprise," will be sent post free to any address for 6d. Orders should be addressed, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 12, Caledonian Road, London, N.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

LABOUR AT THE POLLS.

A VICTORY FOR CONFUSION.

SINCE the General Election much twaddle has been uttered concerning the result thereof. It has been a "Great Victory for Labour," the "Triumph of Socialism," and the like. Let us examine some of the polls, with a view to seeing how far Labour has won a victory and Socialism has triumphed.

The Social Democratic Federation were enabled, by the Countess of Warwick and a mysterious "rich sympathiser" down Cornwall way, to contest six constituencies, and allowed some members to run under Trade Union auspices, permitting the breaking of the rules of the S.D.F. where necessary to secure Trade Union and L.R.C. support. It is a significant and satirical fact that this body, claiming to be of and for the working class, could not have sent at least three out of its seven candidates to the poll had it not been for the gold of Lady Warwick and the mysterious friend referred to above.

The S.D.F. candidates and constituencies contested, with the polls, were the following:—

Candidates	Constituency	Liberal Poll	Conservative Poll
Kennedy	Aberdeen, N.	1,834	4,848
Hartley	Bradford, E.	3,090	6,185
Hyndman	Burnley	4,932	5,288
Jones	Camborne	109	4,614
Gribble	N'hampton	2,361	4,472
Williams	Accrington	2,537	4,235
Irving	Accrington	4,852	7,209

The solid vote for Gribble and Williams was 2,214, so the total S.D.F. vote was 17,131. This is rather over the mark, because the S.D.F. Executive only gave the Accrington Branch permission to put forward Irving "subject to the approval of the local Trades Council," so that Irving's was really a joint candidature, not an S.D.F. one alone.

Other members of the S.D.F. who contested seats were Quelch at Southampton and Belt at Hammersmith, both of whom ran as "Labour" candidates under the auspices of local Trades Councils, and Thorne at South West Ham, who was originally the candidate of the West Ham Trades Council, but who, on the instructions of the Gas Workers' Union, signed the L.R.C. Declaration and ran as a "Labour" candidate under its auspices. At Rochdale the S.D.F. supported S. G. Hobson (L.L.P.), who ran as a Socialist. The polls were:—

Candidates	Liberal Poll	Conservative Poll
Hammersmith	885	4,562
Rochdale	2,506	5,912
Southampton	2,146	7,032
S. W. Ham	10,198	6,255

Only 1,155 of Mr. Quelch's poll were "plumpers."

It will be noticed that, with two exceptions, all the constituencies for which an S.D.F. member stood returned Liberals, and in one of the exceptions there was no Liberal candidate. This result is instructive in view of what appeared in "Justice" for Jan. 13. Said the editor (H. Quelch): "We have, as the phrase goes, 'smashed up' the Liberals in all those constituencies in which, in spite of hypocritical eleventh-hour appeals, they did not leave us a clear field to try the issue direct with the Tories." Of course, this was sheer brag, and can only bring a body indulging in it into ridicule. As Mr. Hyndman remarks, "The S.D.F. has stood, and can stand, a lot of ridicule. But ridicule is apt to kill." Mr. Hyndman is right.

Strenuous efforts were made by the S.D.F. to get the Liberal candidates out of the way and thus leave the S.D.F. "a clear field to try the issue direct with the Tories." But if the S.D.F. candidates are only concerned to get into Parliament by the votes of the *Socialist* working class, it should make no difference to them how many capitalist factions put up candidates, excepting in so far as the more candidates to divide the non-Socialist vote, the better chance of the *Socialist* electors putting their candidate at the top of the poll. And why all this passing of resolutions, breaking up Liberal meetings, and wire-pulling to keep a Liberal out of the field? Why not

move heaven and earth to get the Conservative out of the way and try the issue direct with the Liberals?

At Burnley, Mr. Hyndman, of course, ran as a Social Democrat, but was quite willing to get elected by non-Socialist votes. In his election address he appealed to them to elect him so that he might "plead in Parliament for the sad and suffering millions of India." The prospect of effecting the Social Revolution by *pleading* to the capitalist class to relieve to some slight degree the "sad and suffering millions," is a very remote one. British policy in India, said Mr. Hyndman, is "destroying, with inconceivable imbecility, the greatest market in the world for Lancashire cotton goods." Now, this was an appeal to the interests of a section of the working class and their masters, which any non-Socialist could make quite as effectively, if not more so. A drastic change in the direction referred to would tend, if it provided an extended market for Lancashire cotton goods, to give a new lease of life to British Textile Industries, and thus defer the final collapse of Capitalism. Strenuous efforts, also, were made to secure the Irish vote. In fact, Mr. Hyndman's friends and also Mr. Hartley at Bradford assert that they lost the election because "the Irish vote was awarded to the Liberals." We have yet to learn why the Irish should be expected to vote for Socialists, unless they are themselves Socialists. It has also been suggested that Mr. Hyndman would have won had there been a second ballot. But we claim that a vote that will be cast for a capitalist candidate at the first ballot and for a Socialist at the second is in no sense a class-conscious Socialist vote and could not be relied upon to back up revolutionary action taken by Socialists in Parliament.

In his election address, Mr. H. Quelch said, "Having been selected as their candidate by the Trades and Labour Council, and other working class organisations in the Borough, and 'I and the Party for which I speak, the Labour Party of Southampton,' etc. A leaflet issued contained a cartoon showing three men, 'The Landlord' on the back of 'Rates and Taxes,' who in turn was on the back of 'Ratepayer.' 'Vote for Quelch and get them off your back.' Another leaflet was headed 'A Bid Pay for Liberalism,' and probably had some reference to the day when the Liberals of Southampton decided to break their agreement with Mr. Quelch's 'Labour Party,' and run a second candidate. This leaflet urged the establishment of a 'Labour Party,' and called upon its readers to 'Put the candidates of the Labour Representation Committee into Parliament.' No mention is made in this literature of the S.D.F., although, according to 'Justice,' Mr. Quelch was an S.D.F. candidate. Time was when Mr. Quelch wrote: 'We want our men elected as Social Democrats, for the greater glory of Social Democracy. If they cannot be elected as Social Democrats, they had much better remain outside. We want our men elected as Social Democrats, independent of all other factions.'

Mr. J. Jones said he was "defeated ignominiously because he was the victim of lying misrepresentation," and that "if they knew all the circumstances in connection with that fight they would say he had done a lot better than they expected." Well, Mr. Jones has been repeatedly asked to tell *all* the circumstances but he has preferred to be "the victim of lying and misrepresentation" to doing so. He has, however, admitted that he himself did not know *all* the circumstances as the name and address of the "rich sympathiser" whose money was being so lavishly spent were unknown to him. Not only so, but the members of S.D.F. Executive were equally in the dark concerning this spook-like being, for at their meeting on Nov. 29th, 1901, "The Secretary reported that he had been introduced to, and had had an interview with, the gentleman who was prepared to find the money for a Socialist candidate in the mining division of Cornwall; he had revealed himself to him

on the strict understanding that his identity should go no further." After this one and only "materialization," the E.C., at their next meeting, decided to run Mr. Jones.

At Hammersmith, Mr. Belt, described in *Justice* as "London's Socialist Candidate," though he was careful to keep the word "Socialist" out of his election address, issued a special handbill pointing out that it was not the fault of the "Labour" Party that the "forces of progress" were divided, as they had brought out their candidate on the promise of the Liberal Association to support him, and that the Labour Party were "most anxious to arbitrate" as to which of the "forces of progress," Liberal or Labour, should nominate the candidate. Thus did Mr. Belt present a clear issue to the working-class of Hammersmith. He, like Mr. Irving at Accrington, signed the L.R.C. Declaration, but neither was adopted by the L.R.C.

The Independent Labour Party "played the game" by running nearly all their candidates under the auspices of the L.R.C. In several cases they contested double-member constituencies, and not only got in by Liberal votes, but made arrangements with the Liberals to work and vote together. Here are some of the polls:—

Constituency	Candidate	Plumpers	Splits with Liberals	Splits with Tories
Merthyr	Keir Hardie	2,304	7,883	—
Blackburn	Snowden	1,504	7,871	907
Leicester	MacDonald	426	13,969	260
Halifax	Parker	211	8,572	154
Sunderland	Summerbell	833	11,323	1,274

Writing in the *Clarion* after the election, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald said, "We shall remain an Independent Labour Party, absolutely." We have italicised "remain" because we deny that Mr. MacDonald won Leicester on independent lines.

After the poll was declared a meeting was held at the Liberal Club, at which Ald. Wood congratulated them upon their magnificent victory. He was proud of the Liberals of Leicester, proud of the Labour Party of Leicester and of the unity of action which had brought about that great triumph. Mr. Henry Broadhurst said that Labour and Liberalism had known no difference, as shown by the extraordinary equality of votes between Mr. MacDonald and himself. That is what they did when they had trust in each other. There was one man who had made that grand result possible, and that was Alderman Wood, but for whose years of devotion to unity they might have been a divided people again. Three cheers were given for Ald. Wood.

At the same time a meeting was being held by the Labour Party. Councillor Banton, in opening, said the Liberals had polled with them (cheers) and they reciprocated the fight side by side (loud cheers). Mr. MacDonald said there had been one very significant fact about the contest. Practically every voter of the 14,000 had polled Broadhurst and MacDonald (cheers). The plumping had been insignificant, and consequently (Voices: "Three cheers for MacDonald and Broadhurst.") He wanted to read the following message to them: "I wish you to give my hearty congratulations to the Labour Party on the Progressive victory at Leicester to-day. (Signed) Ald. Wood." (Voices: "Three cheers for Ald. Wood.") which were heartily given. The Alderman had told him that he would be 67 years of age to-morrow. They had given him a magnificent birthday present (cheers). Let them be perfectly clear. The *Mercury* had said that the two parties Liberal and Labour had been occupying quite independent positions during the whole of the contest, but owing to the great crises that the late government had brought upon this country—the crisis to Trade Unionism and the crisis to industry—they had, upon those specific and definite points, co-operated for the purpose of killing the late government, and preventing things going from bad to worse.

At Halifax Mr. Parker openly advised his

supporters to give one vote to the Liberal. The defeat of the Tory, said the *Halifax Guardian*, was entirely due to the alliance between the Liberal and Socialist Parties, which had occurred for the first time in the political history of Halifax. The figures showed unmistakably that the combination had held good, that Liberal votes by the thousand went for Socialism, and that Socialism reciprocated this support to the fullest extent of its power.

The *Guardian*, however, is a bit out in calling it a victory for Socialism. Even Mr. Parker only claimed "that the result had shown that Halifax at heart was in favour of progress." At the Oddfellows' Hall Mr. M. J. Blatchford said, after speeches from Mr. Parker and others, the result showed that the arrangement made by the Liberals had been honestly carried out by both parties. It had been a magnificent display of confidence. Nothing could be more splendid than the confidence each party had shown in the other. He was entirely satisfied that the Labour Party and the Liberal Party had done what they had undertaken to do and he thought both sides might be proud of it (cheers).

Mr. F. W. Jowett contested W. Bradford and won the seat against both Liberal and Conservative, but according to Mr. Hartley, the S.D.F. candidate for the adjoining division, he ran as a Labour candidate because "he believes in getting your man in."

Amongst L.R.C. candidates who contested two-member constituencies were the following:

Constituency.	Candidate.	Plumpers.	Splits with Liberals.	Splits with Tories.
Norwich	Roberts	635	10,097	327
Stockport	Wardle	642	6,000	657
Newcastle	Hudson	1,013	17,396	460
Bolton	Gill	1,818	7,828	770
Portsmouth	Sanders	3,883	2,010	1,053
York	Stuart	421	4,042	110
Dundee	Wilkie	2,553	3,307	963

After the declaration of the poll at Norwich Mr. Roberts said there were local political factors which had been used to their advantage and the certain promises by the other party had evidently been carried out. He wished to add that they were quite willing to work hand-in-hand with any other section or party of the State who were willing to labour for the realisation of industrial reform.

At York, when it became known that Mr. Stuart was not elected, some strong remarks were passed by his supporters at the Labour Committee Rooms. Because the Liberals had given Mr. Greenwood 2,082 plumpers and Mr. Stuart's only numbered 421, Mr. Hawkin declared that it was "the last time that he would ever agree to any compromise with any party whatever."

It is quite evident that these gentlemen, when they found the election upon them, threw over all the "independence" they had been insisting upon and signing declarations upon previously. It was much more important to most of them that they should be M.P.s than that a clear lead should be given to the working class. *Reynold's* asserts that Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald had interviews with one or more representatives of the Liberal Party with a view to an arrangement. We cannot say whether this is so, but it certainly is given colour by a letter from a Wakefield Liberal which appeared in the *Daily News* of Jan. 3rd. The writer asserted that the official Liberals would not help the local Liberals to find a candidate because of a compact which the official Liberals had made with the Labour Party.

Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) and Mr. Steadman (East Finsbury) are members of the National Democratic League. We believe they are both vice-presidents. The N.D.L. exists, "not to oppose, but to help the Liberal Party." Mr. Crooks was an L.R.C. candidate, and has signed the Declaration of Independence! Mr. Steadman refused to sign this, and ran as a Liberal-Labour candidate. But Mr. Steadman was put forward by the London Trades Council, which is affiliated to the L.R.C., and whose S.D.F. chairman (Mr. H. Quelch) has referred to Mr. Steadman as "our" (L.R.C.) candidate since his refusal to sign the L.R.C. Declaration. Over the *non de plume* TATTLER, Mr. Quelch writes in *Justice*:

The London Trades Council is pledged to independent political action, and is affiliated to the L.R.C. John Burns demonstrates his hostility to an independent working-class party by joining the Liberal Government. The London Trades Council endorses the candidature of a number of independent candidates, including, I believe, Quelch at Southampton

and Stranks at Croydon. John Burns, as he was in duty bound to do, supported the Liberal candidates at Croydon and Southampton; and then the Trades Council, by 75 votes to 35, congratulates John Burns on accepting an office which made it incumbent upon him to oppose the candidates whom the Council supported, and the policy to which the Council is pledged. It really is very funny!

Why doesn't Mr. Quelch complete the paragraph? Would it be too funny?

Another L.R.C. candidate has been showing how "independent" he is of the L.R.C. Declaration which he has signed. On Monday, Feb. 12th, at the Liberal Club, Elm Grove, the Peckham Liberals celebrated their victory at the election by entertaining the new member (Mr. Goddard Clarke) at a Dinner and Concert. After a number of congratulatory speeches Mr. C. W. Bowerman, M.P., said he made no apology though a Labour member for being present. As a Labour man he was very much indebted to the Liberals of Deptford for the position he occupied. The best Liberals in Deptford came and supported him. For the first time in political history the workmen had been alive to their own interests. And as long as the Liberal Party will be loyal to them they will be loyal in return.

Mr. Percy Aklen, Liberal and Progressive candidate for Tottenham, issued a pamphlet on "His Public and Civic Life," written by Mr. Will Crooks. At the end are letters from "Labour Leaders," including Messrs. Will Crooks, Will Thorne, W. C. Steadman, J. Passmore Edwards and George Cadbury. The two first have signed the L.R.C. Declaration of Independence. Mr. W. Thorne is a member of the S.D.F., and in his letter he says, "I come into conflict with many of my comrades for backing up men like yourself, but that I cannot help." There's independence for you! Other supporters who sent letters were Messrs. H. H. Asquith, James Bryce, Herbert Gladstone, John Burns, Sydney Buxton and John E. Ellis. What a galley!

Space will not allow us to give details of other alleged "Labour" and "Socialist" candidates, but sufficient has been said to show the hollowness of the claim that there has been a victory for Labour or a triumph for Socialism. If further evidence is required one has only to take the declarations of the successful candidates as to why they won and what they think should be done. Free Trade, Trades Disputes Bill, Chinese Labour, and the like. There is only one phrase that will express the result—It was a

VICTORY FOR CONFUSION. J.K.

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

WATFORD.

Dead? Not much. Not by a jugful. Just busy, that's all. Too busy to report, even at times. But alive! O! very much alive. Ask our local Labour-misleading friends the enemy. They may conceivably wish we were dead. It isn't their fault we are not. But we won't die, ingrates that we are. So they try the game of ignoring us. It's a goose game. And their elaborately simulated indifference is worth coming a long way to see. As a sample this:— Before the election the local S.D.F. and L.L.P. who jointly make up a third body—the Labour Church—issued a manifesto. (Incidentally and in justice to the author it should be stated that a considerable portion of the manifesto was lifted without acknowledgement from a pamphlet by G. A. Glyde.) This document urged the workers to abstain from voting. Whereupon the chairman of the L.L.P. Branch (also member of the L.C.) promptly appeared upon the Liberal candidate's platform, moving resolutions of support—an example immediately followed by another member of the L.C. As a result the Branch published a repudiation of their chairman's action in *publicly* supporting the Liberal and called upon him to resign. His chairman-ship. Of course we could do no less than point out in the public press that the action of the Watford L.L.P. was out of harmony with the L.L.P. action all over the country, citing the case of the neighbouring Harrow Branch, which had supported the Liberal candidate, and emphasising the inevitable confusion in the working-class mind such muddled tactics must engender. Also we asked a few questions! Thus. If the

matter was of the importance to warrant public repudiation, would not the only logical and sufficient action of the L.L.P. have been the expulsion of the member? If it had been a private member instead of a chairman would he have been called upon to resign membership? If so why not the chairman? If not what is the value of the Branch action? And would it have been all right if the support of the member had been given the member privately, seeing that it was his *public* action that impelled the Branch to move? Again would the L.L.P. refuse future support to the second individual mentioned who, as a member of the Labour Church and Trades Council was supported in his candidature for public office by the L.L.P. and S.D.F.? And would the L.C. and S.D.F. publicly repudiate his action in supporting the Liberal? The reply from all these bodies has been a very loud and very interesting silence—the sort of answer we are very familiar with here because the only answer that may safely be vouchsafed. However, the local council elections are at hand, when they will probably hear from us again.

One other matter only may be squeezed into our present note. The Party membership is aware that the police have taken action to prevent our meetings in the Market Square. The Salvation Army, however, are not interfered with. After which exhibition of even-handed justice it will be no matter for surprise that the chief constable's name is Daniel! We have had an interesting correspondence with this worthy which may see the light of publicity in the future. The police fiat came to us at the end of last year's open-air season, so that there has been no particular need for hurried action. But as it seems inevitable that our meetings in the coming summer will be interfered with, we hope the Organisation will take the question into early consideration. Members prepared to accept the hospitality of His Britannic Majesty's lock-up are urged to communicate with the E.C., to whom the matter has been referred, at once.

THE BRANCH.

PECKHAM.

At the end of last year this branch vacated its old premises, for the sole reason that they were more expensive than useful. This trifling circumstance has been commented on by a member of one of the several utopian reform associations of this district as an indication of our decline. On the contrary, we have much reason to be gratified with an all-round improvement—increased attendance at branch meetings, an enthusiastic desire to make our influence felt when opportunities offer, and a healthy condition of the funds. This, by way of warning to those who await our funeral not to be over-sanguine (and kindly note that in the Socialist Party we do not "tell lies in the interests of the organisation.") The performances of the fatuous pseudo-Socialists are always interesting, if not instructive. On Feb. 7, Mr. John Clark, M.A., S.D.F., was permitted to lecture at the Peckham Liberal Club on the "Points on which Socialists and Liberals can agree." Needless to add, the usual stale list of impossible radical reforms were advocated with the usual sentimental fervour.

During the election contest in the neighbouring constituency of Deptford, a local official of the S.D.F. displayed the "vote for Bowerman" placard, notwithstanding that gentleman's plain declaration to his fellow trade unionists that "He had always been a Liberal, and would probably remain one." Therefore, one is not surprised to read in the official journal of the London Society of Compositors that Mr. Bowerman "has been welcomed by the majority of the Liberals in the district, many of whom worked strenuously to secure the return of the Labour Candidate." Incidents like the foregoing constantly recurring show the necessity for a genuine revolutionary Socialist Party apart from those whose political tactics are marked by confusion, pusillanimity, and compromise.

W.K.

FULHAM.

Although this branch has only been fairly active during the winter, the literature sales have been well kept up. We held a splendid "No vote" meeting on Saturday, Jan. 13th.

Plenty of questions and opposition were the order of the day.

One sequel to this meeting was a lengthy discussion in a local paper, in which our position was upheld against the Liberals, who talked about political suicide, disfranchisement, etc. Several young fellows are studying Socialist literature in order to properly grasp our position before joining the party. All things considered, all is well.

E.J.B.A.

TOOTING.

We have held some encouraging meetings at Streatham Drinking Fountain, where we have found a favourable spot for open-air work. Comrade Moore has debated with a local Progressive whom he had no difficulty in disposing of.

STANDARDS and Manifestos have sold well, and the special Party Election Manifesto was got into circulation so effectively that we have been credited by the local Liberals with losing them the seat. We have opened premises at 29, The Parade, Upper Tooting Road, where any evening after 8 we shall be glad to welcome any who desire closer acquaintance with the Party Principles.

A.B.

THE PILLORY.

"What we want now is money. Get it—honestly if you can, of course—but get it... We will take all of it we can get for our present electoral contests."

After this barefaced appeal will the S.D.F. candidates still pretend to be shocked at the suggestion that they are being financed with Tory money? *Cambridge Liberal Election Leaflet*

If the "similar leaflets" contained the same sort of "stuff," wherein lies the cause for "Justice's" complaint? The "stuff" is reproduced from the columns of "Justice." It is "Justice's" own particular "stuff." What are we to conclude? Is it that in "Justice" the "stuff" is "literary matter" and only becomes "stuff" when used against the S.D.F.? If so, who is to blame the writer of the "literary matter" which is "stuff" or the reproducer thereof? "Justice" should be more explicit. However, "stuff" is a good word. Let it stand.

Our only hope lies in successful political action. S.D.F. thinks proper to nominate me and the delegates choose to elect me. I am quite ready to rejoin the Executive of our organisation. *H. M. Hyndman, Feb. 3, 1906, resigning from S.D.F. E.C. Aug. 1st, 1906.*

The question now arises—Is this change of view due to the improvement of the S.D.F. or the deterioration of H.M.H.? The evidences of the former are not very perceptible; and the enthusiastic S.D.F.-er will indignantly repudiate the suggestion that his organisation ever changes. "As it was in the beginning," etc. On the other hand the same enthusiast will let off all sorts of rhetorical fireworks in protest against the suggestion that H.M.H. has deteriorated. Ah! Well! It isn't the only S.D.F. problem the S.D.F.-er cannot solve.

for the man of cool, calculating, reflective mind, there had been Bernard Shaw's candid acknowledgement on a Bursley platform that through all these years Hyndman had been right in his uncompromising course, and the tactical error had lain with the Fabian pursuing a permeation which did not permeate.

Justice, 20.1.06.

No comment necessary except, perhaps! He (Keir Hardie) has pursued a very difficult course, with indomitable courage and unswerving independence and steadfast fidelity. His disposition as leader of the new party

The Fabian Society is always right. The stupendous and abysmal incapacity for public affairs (of the Social Democratic Federation) and the absence of all sense of proportion and even of humour, are beyond all words. I apologise to the universe for my connection with such a Party.

Bernard Shaw, 2.2.06.

will call for the constant display of those qualities by which he has gained the position.

The right man in the right place.

Justice, 17.2.06.

We Social Democrats are ready and eager to render them (the new Labour members) any assistance we can outside the House of Commons. They have undertaken a very heavy responsibility. We hope and believe they will rise to the level of the occasion.

Justice, 17.2.06.

It is not easy to see what useful purpose they (the Labour members) serve. They rally to the support of the opposition and vote steadily against the Government at the bidding of the Liberal Whips, but that any ordinary capitalist Liberal could do so. Things have come to a fine pass when a Liberal paper complains of the supineness of the Labour members.

Justice, 20.5.05.

The fact is these Labour members have mistaken their position. They no longer regard themselves as agitators. To them the House of Commons appears as a sort of haven of rest, entrance into which is the garrison of a life's work accomplished. Their constant prayer appears to be "give peace in our time, O Lord." They are clothed with dignity as with a garment and they object to

So we are to "hope and believe" that the men who for years have been only distinguished from capitalist members by pusillanimity and cowardice and supineness: who have done nothing for the people: who formed a grovelling appendage to the Liberal Party: will rise to the level of the occasion. And why? The pusillanimous cowards of the last Parliament have been returned to this. Only there are more of them. Are the new men better than the old? How? Does *Justice* want us to play the fool game of waiting for results we know are sure? Is experience no use at all? Or is *Justice's* change of front intended to pave the way for the return of the S.D.F. to the L.R.C. from which so many of its members regret having withdrawn and whose financial and other assistance they so earnestly desire for their own candidates?

Before the Election.

N O S L A V E R Y

U N D E R T H E F L A G

T H I S I N F A M O U S

C H I N E S E L A B O U R

O R D I N A N C E M U S T

B E I M M E D I A T E L Y

R E P E A L E D

THE ETHICS OF REVOLUTION.

In stating the case for Socialism the modern revolutionist proceeds, from the material ground-work upon which Society rests, to trace the manner in which present-day capitalist society came into being; to show the forces at work within that society, and to explain how the foundation is being prepared for a social revolution. In showing how men's actions are mainly determined by their material interests, and how the economic factor is the chief determinant of material conditions, the Socialist takes little notice of the individual as such, but deals almost solely with the classes which are in existence owing to economic necessity. It is generally admitted that environment is a principal factor in the creation of character; so that the strength of the Socialists' claim as to the importance of the economic factor is at once apparent.

Some good people in the Labour movement, however, are keenly endeavouring to get the workers to study ethics. They urge that the world would be much better and happier if only people were more moral and altruistic, and they further argue that if the working class, the despised and rejected of men, would display a higher morality, the capitalist class would be converted to the Labour movement. The Socialist has one of his most insidious foes in the ethical culturist. Their position is a denial of the materialist basis of Socialism, because it is simply an appeal to the individual, as though the majority of individuals could elevate themselves above their environment. If the teaching of ethics were all that is required to bring social salvation, how comes it that after 2,000 years of the teaching of the ethics of Christianity for example, the heavers of wood and drawers of water are worse off than they have been for ages? Buddha, Confucius, and others taught the Golden Rule long before Christ, yet the world is little the better.

The teaching of love and brotherhood, in a system that exists owing to the robbery of one class by another, is immoral. The moral course is that followed by the Socialist, who points out why this robbery takes place, explains the method by which it is done, and shows how it may be ended. The Socialist alone, in the light of his economic determinism, can point to the moral advances of the past and lay his finger on each of the causes.

The advance from cannibalism to chattel-slavery was only accomplished because the domestication of animals and the growth of agriculture made it more profitable to enslave a man than to eat him. The change from chattel-slavery to wage-labour occurred through the advent of machinery which rendered "free" wage-labour more profitable, because the wage-labourer has only to be kept while producing profit, whereas the chattel-slave had to be kept whether his labour was profitable or not.

Both cannibalism and chattel-slavery appear immoral now, because the advanced material position renders them unnecessary. Under Socialism, the worker having lost his commodity character, wage-slavery will appear just as immoral as chattel-slavery and cannibalism do now.

Standing firmly all the time on his materialist philosophy, the Socialist keeps clear of the illogical position taken up by the ethicist and the alleged Labour leader. Realising that with a society whose material foundation is conducive to a better relationship between man and man, a higher morality must ensue because of this advance in civilisation, he endeavours to teach his fellow members of the working class the opposition of the capitalist class and system to their interests, and the immorality of their position, and he organises them for the overthrow of capitalism, and the establishment of the higher system—Socialism. The revolutionist is the most moral because he points out the causes of to-day's evils, and organises to uproot them, while the Utopian ethicist leads the workers, consciously or unconsciously, in a manner calculated to breed despair, since they do not show the way to social emancipation, but on the contrary, blind them to the root causes of their misery. Revolution alone is moral, because it is consistent with the facts of life. The revolutionist is the true ethical teacher, because he endeavours to establish a form of society in which man's relationship with his fellows would necessitate a higher ethic than that of to-day. E.J.B.A.

We regret that we are compelled to leave over, until next issue, a further instalment of our translation of Karl Kautsky's "Das Erfurter Programme."

Note to the working class Sold again!

A NEW CURE.

Is the February issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD our comrade, Dick Kent, dealt with the latest quick remedy of the Salvation Army for solving unemployment. Now comes a writer in the *Daily News* an "economic expert" who traces the cause of unemployment to the wasteful expenditure of wealth. Bow your heads, ye Solomons who taught the workers that they were poor because they were robbed. Shade your eyes from the dazzling light thrown upon this, up till now, difficult problem by the economic constellation above. Can ye not see that it is not because Dick Turpin robs you that you are poor, but because, after he has emptied your pockets, he spends the proceeds of his industry in a wasteful manner. If, instead of spending this wealth among pals and girls, he were to turn it in the direction of useful production—such as the pistols and ammunition he employs for the purpose of persuading you to agree with him upon the point of wealth distribution—how much better off everyone would be. True! those already engaged in that industry would find their occupation gone by the inflow of new workers, unless they succeeded in beating them off the market by underselling them. In either case one set would still be unemployed.

"I know of no Labour member," says this economic sunbeam, "who does not desire to call men from the building of warships and the making of rifles to the construction of houses and the feeding and clothing of the people."

Note the phrasing of the last sentence. To construct houses does not necessarily mean the housing of the constructors; and to jumble this up with "the feeding and clothing of the people" without explaining how this latter is to be done, is to add to the confusion already existing. He would call men from building warships to build houses, and then, I suppose, place these upon an already fearfully overstocked market, compared to the effective demand, with the result of throwing out of work those at present precariously employed, and so replacing the present unemployed army by another. Then, we may suppose, this army will be set to work and thereby displace the displacers. The Inner Circle is a fool to it. Also the other sections of men now making rifles are to be put to making foodstuffs and clothing so that the sweated bakers, tailors, etc. will either have to "sweat" more to keep their hold upon the market or become unemployed themselves. This solution staggers the imagination of even the best balanced minds to see where it will end—other than where it began.

Under the present system of private ownership of the means of wealth production, and of the wealth when produced, the workers are unemployed just because they have produced too much for the effective demands of the market to absorb. The first step to be taken in dealing with the problem is obviously, not to set about increasing the extent of the difficulty by producing still more, but for the workers to have access to, and ownership of, that which they have already produced. It is not the want of commodities that is the trouble, but the private ownership of them, and the consequent prevention of the workers getting hold of the articles, that is at fault.

But "economic experts" are not paid by the ruling class to spread the truth, but to throw the weight of their "learning" and "science" upon the side of those who are engaged in keeping the mind of the workers directed away from the real question, and fixed upon one of the numerous "red herrings" before them.

J.F.

VOL. I.

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Well bound in stiff boards.

Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be sent to Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

Printed by Jacob & Bros., 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 1A, Caledonian Rd., London, N.

S.P.G.B.
North London District Council.DURING MARCH
LECTURES

WILL BE GIVEN AS USUAL.

On the 18th

ALEXANDER ANDERSON will speak
on "THE PARIS COMMUNE."THE SECOND
ANNUAL CONFERENCE

OF

The Socialist Party of
Great Britain

WILL BE HELD ON

Good Friday & Sat., 13 & 14 April, 1906

AT THE

COMMUNIST CLUB, 107, Charlotte St.,

Fitzroy Square, LONDON, W.

Commencing at 10 a.m. each day.

A "SOCIAL"
will be held on Good Friday,
7.30 p.m.

AT THE SAME ADDRESS.

Admission Free. Members and Friends invited.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as
well as anyone else.JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

W.W.—Yes. We saw Shaw's *Clarion* article and found it as to almost one half lies and as to most of the other half, blether. We know of no writer who can lie more readily and no writer who can cram so much blether into a given compass. The smartness of some of his fooling is of course granted and so long as it is understood as fooling, there's not much harm done. But quite a number of people seem anxious to believe that behind the fooling there is a desperate earnestness and a set purpose, which may, indeed, be the case, only the purpose hardly ever succeeds in penetrating the top crust of foolery. We should not worry about him. You doubtless noticed that part of his article flatly contradicted other parts, and you will find that future articles and speeches will just as flatly contradict all of it. His one consistent belief is in the infallibility of the Fabian Society and as this Society is practically Shaw, the belief is natural.

Received *La Vanguardia*, Buenos Aires; *The Gaelic American*, New York; *Weekly People*, New York; *Labour*, St. Louis, Mo.; *The Hikari* (The Light), Tokyo.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

1A, CALEDONIAN RD., KING'S CROSS, LONDON, N.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

BEXLEY & DISTRICT.—R. A. V. Morris, Sec., Oxshott, Warren Rd., Bexley Heath. Branch meets 1st, 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month at Sec's House at 8. Public Lectures 3rd Wednesdays at Coverdale Hall, Bexley Heath, 8.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmingtong Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmingtong Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—G. Wilson, Sec., 14, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets every Saturday at 8.30 at above address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 309, North End Road, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—T. Bennett, Sec., 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Tuesdays at 8.30 at the Co-op. Stores, 79, Grove Rd., Holloway.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m. at the Branch Rooms, 29, The Parade, Tooting, which are open to members and friends every evening.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8 o'clock at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—J. G. Graver, Sec., 52, Frith Road, Leytonstone. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 19, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Rd., London, N.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ...	5s. 6d.
SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ...	5s. 6d.
POVERTY (Rowntree) ..	4s. 6d.
SOCIALIST STANDARD (Vol. I. Bound) ...	3s. 6d.
MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. ...	1d.
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ...	2d.
WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) ...	1d.
JONES' BOY ...	1d.
SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) ...	1d.
HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) ...	1d.
THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) ...	6d.

ALL POST FREE.

BATTERSEA—

Will hold a Social at Sydney Hall, to-morrow (Sunday) evening, at which all comrades and friends will be welcomed. On Sunday the 11th, an open discussion will take place on the contents of this issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD; on the 18th they will hold a Commune Celebration; and on the 24th, H. J. Neumann will deliver a lecture on "The 2nd and 3rd Books of Karl Marx."

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 20. VOL. 2.]

LONDON, APRIL, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

That the Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

THE EVOLUTION OF REVOLUTIONARY BURNS.

(Extracts from a speech delivered by John Burns at the Old Bailey when tried for seditious conspiracy on April 9th, 1886.)

THESE extracts from a speech of the Burns of the Eighties have been reproduced so that the working class may have an opportunity of contrasting the present views of this Right Honourable person with the views he then enunciated. It has been, and still is, the fashion to gibe and jeer at the *rotte facer* of another Right Honourable turn-coat (Joseph Chamberlain) and no one has delighted in the exercise more than Burns himself. Yet it has recently been held to be an exhibition of bad taste to bring Burns' own past up in evidence against him—and no one was more righteously indignant than Burns! The Burns revolution has been far and away more complete than that of Chamberlain and it is the more conspicuous because of the price Burns received for his apostasy—a price the recipient has so often rejoiced in the size of. The hope that Burns expressed in '86 that the penalty for the betrayal of the working class would be heavy enough to deter anyone from attempting it has not been realized. The penalty has not been enough for Burns! We do not, of course, suggest anything so absurd that a man may not change his view, seeing it is upon that change of view in the working class that we rely for the realization of Socialism. But we are concerned to emphasize the point that the Burns of yesterday, who has secured his present position by virtue of his influence with the unthinking working class, is very far from being the Burns of to-day. It is more necessary to emphasize this difference than many think. Undoubtedly Burns secured his following as the Burns of the Eighties by his association as a member of the working class with working-class movements. And undoubtedly it was because this following held to the idea of a practically unchanged Burns, an idea insinuating itself into an ever wider circle, that Burns' services as a decoy were purchased by the Liberal Party. These extracts may help to destroy that illusion. Burns is now engaged in administering that capitalist system to which he at one time traced the poverty of the working class. To-day he urges the usual capitalist argument of working-class intemperance as largely the cause of working-class poverty, where previously he designated as liars those who held such views. To-day he is a member of the same sort of government, adopting exactly the same sort of method that he denounced so roundly in '86. Yet poverty has only intensified in the interregnum. Burns' attitude to-day is the capitalist attitude; his method the capitalist method. Only the unthinking section of the working class could fail to note the fact that between Burns and his Tory predecessor there is no material difference. Unfortunately the unthinking section of the working class is very large. Hence these extracts.

My Lord and Gentlemen of the Jury,

I expected that at some time of my life I should be brought face to face with the authorities for vindicting the class to which I belong. I have, from my earliest infancy, been in contact with poverty of the worst possible description. I have done everything I could in a peaceful manner to call the attention of the authorities to the frightful amount of poverty and degradation existing among the working class. I heard that there was going to be a meeting of the starving unemployed of London in Trafalgar Square on February 8th. I reached the place at 1.30. I was recognized. I got upon the plinth and spoke to 13,000 or 14,000 men. I pointed out that a remedy could only be found by bringing pressure to bear upon Parliament and the local authorities as I had tried to do 12 months before when I had to walk the streets of London for 7 weeks for daring to speak as to the condition of the workers. I ask you, can you wonder at a workman's language being strong? I am inclined to think that the day is not far distant when stronger language will have to be used. When the Fair Traders came, I climbed up the balustrade and acted as chairman of that second meeting. Why? All know that the Fair Traders Messrs. Peters, Kelley, Kenny, Lemon and others, are regarded as ardent impostors by the workmen of London and I was desirous that there should not be a physical conflict between the unemployed and those honest but misguided men who are the dupes of these bogus

representatives. The day of these mercenaries I am pleased to say is now over. The penalty for betraying the workers I hope, will be heavy enough to deter any man from selling their cause, as it has many times been sold.

I found that the crowd were becoming somewhat turbulent. . . and I thought it my duty to listen to the suggestion that we should proceed in procession through the West End to Hyde Park. . . No damage was done by the procession. . . until we reached the Carlton Club. . . There is a class of men who make it a practice on occasions of political demonstrations to laugh and jeer from the Club windows at the poverty or what they term "the great unwashed," to jeer at the misery their own greed has created. . . The crowd were not in a temper to respond to contemptuous jeers by a smile. . . Stone throwing commenced. . . And that was the result of the stupid, ungentlemanly, criminal conduct of Carlton Club members. I did my best to repress the stone throwing. . . believing as I do that window breaking, except, perhaps, as a warning, is useless to effect a change in our system of Society, based as it is upon the robbery of Labour. . .

Against this system of Society, I frankly confess I am a rebel, because Society has outlawed me. I have protested against this state of Society by which at present one and a half millions of our fellow countrymen, adult males, are starving—starving because they have no work to do. Talk about strong language! I contend my language was mild when you con-

sider the usage they have received and that the patience under severe provocation displayed by the workers is almost slavish and cowardly. . . . We come before you not as paid agitators . . . but as men anxious to change the existing system of society to one in which men should receive the full value of their labour, in which Society will be regarded as something more than a few titled non-producers who take the whole of the wealth which the useful workers alone produce. . . .

If you want to remove the cause of seditious speeches, you must prevent us from having to hear as we hear to-day, of hungry poverty-stricken men, who from no fault of their own, are compelled to be out of work. . . . I have not one single word of regret to utter for the part I have taken in this agitation. . . . I say we cannot have in England as we have to-day five millions living on the verge of pauperism without gross discontent. . . . I am sorry to say that it seems to be a characteristic of the Government and the governing classes to be influenced only by fear—at least Mr. Gladstone, Lord Randolph Churchill and Mr. Chamberlain say that their Governments are not susceptible to reason or appeals unless the Hyde Park railings are pulled down and the club windows broken. . . . Mr. Chamberlain prior to the riots denied that exceptional distress prevailed; but about a fortnight afterwards he admitted that it was exceptional and severe. . . . It (the riot) also made the landlords and capitalists surrender to the Mansion House Fund some of the proceeds of their past robbery in the shape of charity. . . . That meeting of Feb. 8th called the attention of the people of Great Britain to this fact that

below the upper and middle strata of Society there are millions of people leading hard degraded lives—men who through the unequal distribution of wealth are consigned to the criminal classes and women into the enormous army of prostitutes whom we see in the streets of our great cities. And as an artisan I cannot see poor puny little babes sucking empty breasts and honest men walking the streets for months at a time—I cannot hear of women of the working class being compelled to resort to prostitution to earn a livelihood—I cannot see these things without being moved not only to strong language but to strong action, if necessary. . . . And when the Attorney General says we incited to riots, I say that the Social system is to blame. . . . It prompts men to thieves and it prompts women of the working class to resort to dishonest acts by not giving all a fair start in life and not giving them an opportunity to get honest work. Society journals demand our imprisonment. Why? Because £11,000 worth of windows have been broken. But how about the sacred human lives that have been and are being degraded and blighted by the present system of capitalism? . . .

I shall serve my cause as well inside a prison as out. The word prison has no particular terror for me. Through the present system of Society life has lost all its charm, and a hungry man said truly (as Isaiah said in the Holy Book) that there was a time in the history of our lives when it was better to die in prison or better to die fighting than to die starving. . . . The wonder is that there was not more destruction of property and that no life was lost. If we had given the world, not a single inmate of the Carlton Club would have been alive to-day. . . .

MATTERS PARLIAMENTARY.

THAT "zeal for reform" commented upon in last month's *Socialist Standard* continues to actuate our legislative assembly. That parliamentary passion for progress still inflames the minds and ennobles the purpose of our faithful commons. We still make headway "with sledge-hammer strokes." Privilege and Corruption are like the notorious aunt of the celebrated Charley, "still running," and hot foot upon their trail comes a press of stern, relentless champions of ruth, righteousness, peace and political purity, with souls illumined by the vision of what might be and with minds revolted by the knowledge of what is. We are having a time.

And it's all due to the "Labour" Party and their policy of independence. Straight from the forge and the bench and the coal seam (or nearly straight), they have come to fan the smouldering embers of reform into a fierce white heat once more. There they sit, a small but solidly welded phalanx, splendid in their isolation, unswerving in their determination, yet radiating a warm and genial glow that suffuses the whole house and "with new fervour fills the hearts of men." Already this has borne wonderful fruit. Flogging has been abolished in the Navy—for an experimental twelve months to see whether the Captains can manage to rub along without it. This is a victory for humanitarianism! The Chinese Labour Ordinance has been shewn to be not such a bad affair after all—certainly not slavery—and the Government's decision not to interfere for the present has been upheld. This is a victory for truth! Then the expenditure on armaments is not to be reduced which, although not a victory for retrenchment may be reckoned a victory for efficiency! Also the fiscal *status quo* has been affirmed and the ghost of Protection has been laid—a victory for industrial freedom this!

Three separate and distinct resolutions have been passed in favour of payment of members, payment of election expenses, and old age pensions, subject to certain necessary precautions as to when they shall be put into operation and the scope of their application which are left to the decision of the Government. This is not exactly a victory for anything as the Government has laid it down that the time was never more

inopportune for increased expenditure. The Government has a passion for economy in these directions. Yet whole-souled reformers need not be despondent. All in good time we shall have payment of members and in the interval doubtless public and private subscriptions will come to the aid of the poor but honest and honourable member for Stoke whose gallant struggle with adversity has done so much to force this (to him) pressing question upon the attention of a sympathetic house. In these matters we must, of course, make haste slowly lest financial disaster overtake us. Mr. Ward will understand this and although he is not attached to the Parliamentary "Labour" Party *per se* and is therefore not "independent," he will, with Mr. Roberts who *does* belong to the "Labour Party" and is "independent," repose his perfect confidence in the intentions of the Government and will refuse to embarrass it. It is this spirit of sweet reasonableness which has endeared the "Labour" members to their capitalist fellow-workers and enabled them to achieve in so short a time so many magnificent triumphs. Which shews how, when Capital and Labour work hand-in-hand, apparently insurmountable difficulties may be overcome! We should all be very grateful.

Nevertheless, and at the risk of incurring the opprobrium of those who rejoice in the work of the "Labour" members, we are not grateful. We find no consolation in such victories. Such exhibitions of sweet reasonableness do not appeal to us. We have no confidence in the intentions of the Government because we know the Government and its intentions. It is a capitalist government and its intentions are to maintain capitalist domination. Capitalist domination means continued working-class enslavement; working-class poverty and unhappiness. It intends to maintain the power of the class it represents by a carefully simulated sympathy for the wishes of those who claim to voice working-class requirements. That is its game. It will kill the working-class agitation with kindness.

It will accept any number of reform resolutions of the payment of members order. Why not? They are not dangerous. On the contrary, they are advantageous to capitalist interests because

they obscure the class line, they blur the antagonism existing between Capital and Labour. They convey the idea of a common concern, a common progress towards a mutual objective. If necessary the Government may even translate the resolution into practice without trepidation. It will if pressed. Yet the position of the working class will not even then be affected. How can it be? Such legislative enactments simply do not touch the problem of poverty. But the Government is not pressed even on such immaterial matters as these. The Government accepts the resolutions on the understanding that it will fix its own time to introduce a bill and impose its own limits upon the scope of the measure. It could accept a resolution for the socialization of the means of production upon such terms.

And the "Labour" members accept these conditions without protest and have faith in the intentions of the Government! Such sweet reasonableness? Such damnable stupidity rather. What are such victories worth? What is the independence of the "Labour Party" worth? What are the members of the "Labour Party" worth? And these are the men we are asked to support. These are the methods we are asked to approve. These are the individuals who swell with indignation when their actions are adversely criticised. Why, ordinary hack Liberals have more determination. The boasted "progress" they recognise and proclaim as little short of flummery. They are waiting, they say, for the curtain to rise upon a stage set for what they consider will be *serious* business. Some of them are prepared to move resolutions against their own party and persist, against the appeals of their own chief, to a division. But the "Labour" members are loyal to their chief. And their chief is mightily concerned because he thinks he heard another honourable member say "damn"—while political refugees are being deported back to Russia and there, on the authority of a Rothschild, shot out of hand; and the working-class slave and die waiting in their ignorance for the men who claim to be fighting on their behalf, to act.

If they had any grit, if they had half the courage of the professions some of them have made outside the House of Commons, the "Labour" M.P.'s would break through every form and custom of Parliament to force the hands of the Government on behalf of their class. In the past men of determination have single-handed achieved their purpose in the teeth of the whole 670 representatives of capitalism. And there are a score and ten "Labour" representatives; and they have confidence in the intentions of the Government and decline to embarrass it! "They have no intention of pressing the Government" (Keir Hardie, 19.3.06); and their views on the land question are identical with those of the Minister of Agriculture (W. Crooks, 17.3.06); and they are so interested in the prolongation of the life of the present administration that Crooks, Shackleton, Snowden and others vote for the Government and against a reduction in the land forces moved by a Liberal against his Party. These men of peace and progress; these men who are the new force in politics; these "leaders" of working-class thought; these champions of independence; these harbingers of a new era—faugh! An ounce of civet good Mr. Apothecary while Mr. Thorne and Mr. Crooks act as advertisement touts for works on the hire-purchase system.

Outside the House, however, addressing audiences who believe in them and upon whom they rely for their standing (and their salaries), they can change their tactics. Some of them can wax quite truculent. The talk of their fellow M.P.'s they deride as piffle and the forms of the House are childish and silly. Inside the House they make slavish conformation to the childish forms, and valuable contribution to the derisive piffle. They are clothed with respectability and obsessed by desire to create favorable impressions. But outside the "whispering humbleness" can be shed. They are only anxious to drop the cackle and get to business. And as for confidence in the intentions of the Government, why—! They

have no delusions as to what their reception will be when they demand substantial concessions.

"The moment," says Mr. Keir Hardie at Swansea on the 17th ult., "it became known that the Labour Representation Committee meant encroachment on privilege and monopoly, the fight against it would become earnest" and—

"There has been no contempt shewn in the treatment of Labour so far. Contemptuous treatment can only be extended with safety to those who are not successful and Labour has now succeeded. Vigorous and determined opposition will, no doubt, be offered to the claims of Labour when its advocates demand the substantial concessions and changes which alone can benefit the class which the Labour Party has been specially created to give first assistance to," says Mr. J. R. Clynes in the "Labour Record."

Then why hasn't it become known that the L.R.C. means encroachment upon privilege? And when will "Labour's" advocates demand those substantial concessions which alone can benefit the workers? And why, if the Labour Party has been specially created to give first attention to these substantial concessions, haven't they been given first attention? What are they fooling about? Why don't they drop the cackle and get to business? We are tired of their damnable faces and their smug conceits and their oppressive respectability.

They would not matter were it not for the unfortunate fact that a considerable section of the working class who sit in darkness, are content to pin their hopes of beneficial change to these gentlemen. To us it is all important that the working class should understand why they are poor. Until they do, they cannot take effective action. And the only way by which that may be accomplished is by the consistent and emphatic declaration of the class struggle. The class struggle is submerged by the Parliamentary piousness of the Labour Party marionettes and the working class mind is confused by their vacillations and quick changes. That is why we protest more particularly against the actions of the "Labour" M.P.'s. It is our business to hit as hard as possible those individuals whose work is most calculated to keep the workers in darkness. Just as the most dangerous enemy is the false friend, so the most dangerous working class leader is he who, attached to the working class by birth and breeding, leads that class into an intellectual morass while ostensibly helping them in the direction of their desires. Labour, said Mr. Clynes, has now succeeded. It has—in raising another obstacle to its own progress. AGRA.

PADDINGTON BRANCH REPORT.

Throughout the Winter we have been very busy waging the fight, and have missed only two Sunday meetings and those through rain. Speaking to good-sized audiences and arousing keen interest in the principles of our Party have resulted in considerable discussion and good sales of literature, whilst constant reiteration of Socialism is every day turning the apathetic into the sympathetic, and the sympathetic into out-and-out followers. Just now we are being heckled by one or two of the very old school of Trade Unionism, who, having had the same questions answered by various speakers, still persist in asking them, so proving both their doggedness and the thickness of their skulls. Another phase of our activity is that every Sunday night a number of our comrades have made raids upon some of the strongholds of confusion, carrying death and destruction figuratively speaking into their midst, so that the name of the S.P.G.B. is dreaded by the misleaders of the working class.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, the debate between our comrade Fitzgerald and a local councillor and Tory politician has been carried through with great success before a large audience, and our future task is to transform this triumph into a boom for the S.P.G.B. F.S.L.

SOME PUBLICATIONS.

THE ORIGIN OF LIFE, by Joseph McCabe, (Watts & Co., Ltd.)

Professor Oliver Lodge is a gentleman with whose name the churches delight to conjure. He is one of the very few persons of intellectual standing upon whose help the churches, in their strenuous battle against extinction, always rely. He is their stand-by, the straw at which they catch in their efforts to keep their heads above the waters of oblivion which threaten to engulf them. He is a brake to their feet slipping dangerously upon a sharply deflected path. He enables them to dig their toes into the projections (of ignorance) and hang on.

Nevertheless the gospel according to St. Lodge differs from the gospels of that shadowy quartet of New Testament worthies as the proverbial chalk differs from the proverbial cheese. The god in whom his faith finds lodgement (no joke) is as intangible and elusive as the god of the churches is tangible and well defined—to that eye of faith exclusively the property of the church (and chapel) man. The Churches either don't understand this, or do understand and bury the difference in their quaking hearts. But to our even churchman Professor Lodge is "agin" the "atheist" (a term embracing everything "agin" the Church), and is therefore roped in for the defence of the "faith of our fathers." Hence the alacrity with which the Professor's last book, "Life and Matter," is seized upon and hurled in the face of the presumptuous layman in whose sight "miserable and degraded Monism" and the "extravagant, pretensions" and "rather fly-blown productions" of Professor Haeckel find favour. (It should be mentioned here in fairness to Professor Lodge that the chaste descriptions and the gravely scientific language in quotation marks are his own.)

"Life and Matter" purports to be a criticism of the well-known "Riddle of the Universe" by Professor Haeckel, whose name and work have become a haunting horror—a sort of unholy ghost—to those who sit in the darkness of clerical enlightenment. Mr. Joseph McCabe's brochure is a reply to Professor Lodge. Mr. McCabe is the English translator of Haeckel and one of his most doughty champions. His style, while perfectly fair and courteous, is delightfully trenchant, and the manner in which he "goes for" Professor Lodge affords us who are accustomed to, and if the truth must out, rejoice in, the dialectical "rough and tumble," much satisfaction. He finds small difficulty in disposing of Professor Lodge's anti-Haeckel diatribes and effectively establishes the charge he brings against the Lodge method by showing it to be based upon unblushing misquotation. As is moderately well known, Professor Lodge has been repudiated by biologists of established repute, while his dogmatism (the particular failing he alleges with little justification against Haeckel) was recently very roundly censured and his pretensions to biological knowledge crushed by a vigorously worded intervention from Professor Ray Lancaester. Mr. McCabe presents the problem which Haeckel has made such valuable contribution to the solution of, very ably and summarises the arguments for the monistic position with considerable skill. We cordially commend his book to the consideration of our readers.

WOMEN AS BARMAIDS, P. S. KING & SONS, 1, NETT.

An essay in legislative tinkering, endorsed by the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Southwark. Of a total of 1,171,751 women engaged in various occupations, 27,707 are barmaids. The argument is that the moral atmosphere of a public house is highly reprehensible and results in a larger proportion of assaults, suicides and murders in the barmaid business than in any other. Because of this reprehensible atmosphere and its effects "The Joint Committee on the Employment of Barmaids" (of whose existence we hear for the first time) recommends a bill for the abolition of women in public houses, except when they are the wives or daughters of licence holders when the relationship may, presumably, be expected to counteract the evils of the environment—although if it is the atmos-

phere which is at fault, relationship with the publican could not greatly affect the results complained of. Wives and daughters would still be exposed to the dangers referred to, as for example, assault for refusing to serve a customer alleged to be drunk. (It is quite common we understand in such cases, for the irate customer to demonstrate his or her sobriety by flinging a glass at the barmaid.)

The Joint Committee will not endeavour to ascertain why the atmosphere of a public house is as bad as they have concluded it to be. They will not attempt to lay bare the roots of the disease. They will simply turn 27,707 women out on to an already over-crowded female labour market and then congratulate themselves that these women at any rate, will no longer be affected by the lewd and alcoholically stimulated sensuality of places of call within the meaning of the Act. And the women will, if they are lucky, get other employment where, as in the Potteries, sexual inebriation is stated to be as bad as it can be anywhere, or failing that, may go to recruit the ranks of prostitution or increase the general proportion of suicides. Which is as perfect an example of an endeavour to kill time by putting the hands of the clock forward as it is possible to meet.

The Joint Committee seem to have missed the fact that they are merely pottering with an effect without reference to its cause, and that the only purpose that can be served by prohibiting the sale of drink by women is to shift the problem, not to deal with it. If alcoholic and sexual excitement is the cause of the trouble (of course such excitement is itself merely an effect) it will not be allayed by the absence of barmaids to any notable extent. Failing gratification in the bars, it will go outside. Then we presume the Joint Committee on Barmaids will become the Joint Committee on something else and promote another bill. It is very tiring.

WHAT IS CAPITAL?

The Editor of the *Clarion* in replying to a correspondent, writes, "You evidently don't understand the subject at all. No Socialist ever talks about 'doing away' with capital."

An instance this, truly, of "the blind leading the blind!" To be consistent the *Clarion* should also maintain that no Socialist ever talks about abolishing capitalism, for capitalism obviously cannot end if capital does not cease to exist.

The Socialists of all countries are, however, decidedly agreed that capital must be abolished; and the only explanation of the *Clarion* editor's strange statement is that he lacks a knowledge of the economics of Socialism.

The matter turns upon the definition of capital itself, and apparently the *Clarion* holds the archaic view that capital is simply wealth which aids in the production of further wealth. This is no definition at all, for, as even Professor Marshall is compelled to admit, it is an inclined plane upon which no stable resting place is found until all accumulated wealth is included as capital.

Socialist economics gives a definite meaning to capital as that part of wealth which is used as a means of obtaining an income from the labour of others; in short, as wealth used to obtain "profit." Modern economists have been compelled, in practice, to accept this definition under one form or other of words, in order to give any value at all to the term.

The object of the Socialist movement, therefore, is decidedly to abolish capital; to end the use of wealth as a means of extorting surplus value from the working class. The absurdity of the *Clarion* position is obvious from the fact that any other than the Socialist definition of capital makes every navvy who owns a pickaxe, a capitalist!

The "doing away" with capital, however, no more means the abolition of the instruments of production than the abolition of capitalism implies the doing away with mankind. Socialism ends the system of production for profit, and inaugurates production for social use; it necessarily does away with the use of the means of wealth production as *capital*, and turns them into social instruments for the good of the community.

Economics, however, was never the *Clarion's* strong point.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed, —The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C. THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month. The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months	£ s. d.
...	6 1 6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion	£ s. d.
...	0 2 0
Quarter Column do.	0 5 6
Half Column do.	0 10 0
One Column do.	1 0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.

SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1906.



BEBEL'S INCURSION INTO ENGLISH POLITICS.

In another column we publish the correspondence which has passed between the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, our comrade Bebel, and Vorwaerts, the official organ of the German Socialist Party. There is no occasion to amplify that correspondence, and the only purpose of a reference to it here is to direct attention more particularly to it in justification of the attitude taken up by this Party. That attitude which is, of course, no more than a logical expression of the class struggle, and cannot be departed from by any Socialist except by the immolation of Principle on the altar of Expediency, coincides exactly with the pronouncement made by Bebel himself in other connections. He may only object to it, therefore, at the risk of self stultification. We regret exceedingly that instead of recognising that he had allowed himself to be betrayed into an act calculated, because it lent the countenance of approval to what was merely a capitalist victory, to defeat the purpose of Socialist propaganda, he should have preferred to attempt to exonerate himself by reading into his telegram something which in point of fact was neither implied nor expressed. We expected better things of Bebel.

Our intervention in this matter, however much we may deplore the occasion for it, will, like our protest to the French Socialist Party against the fraternisation of Dr. Brousse (a member of the Party and President of the Municipal Council of Paris) with the L.C.C. representatives of capitalism in municipal politics, serve to show that in England there is now a party jealous of the integrity and the unswerving adherence to principle, of the International Socialist Movement, zealous for the elimination of all confusing elements in industrial and political warfare, and determined to do all in its power however little or much that may be—to organise the working class upon the basis of their distinctive class interests, for the final struggle with the hosts of capitalism, whatever the form of their manifestation, and the realisation of the Co-operative Commonwealth.

Until The Socialist Party of Great Britain came into existence our Continental comrades may well have been in lugubrious ignorance of

the existence of such a party: we sincerely hope our stand for principle will remove any misapprehensions they may have had on this score.

RAMPAGEOUS "REYNOLDS'S."

With regard to the splutteringly splenetic comments which *Reynolds's Newspaper* appears to think the action of our Party in this matter merits, we need only observe that they do not unduly depress us. Curiously enough, we did not expect *Reynolds's* to appreciate our protest. We did not suppose, even, that *Reynolds's* would understand it. If the hard, cold truth must be told we confess that it was not in our mind that, even presuming *Reynolds's* capacity to understand and appreciate a stand for principle, it would have been delighted that the stand should have been made in this particular case. Because if our action secures a wide publicity, and our view obtains a similarly extended endorsement (as we make no doubt it will from those who accept the principle of the class struggle), *Reynolds's* stand exposed as merely the capitalist journal it is. This, of course, would not suit *Reynolds's* book. It relies largely upon its ability to maintain the fiction that it is a desperately "advanced" organ, at whose voice Reaction halts tremblingly.

So far, therefore, from being abashed by the somewhat subtle sarcasm of its references to "a body calling itself The Socialist Party of Great Britain," whose secretary, "a Mr. Lehané" etc., or by its crushing denunciation of us as "an obscure sect of Socialist malcontents," we are almost inclined to hilarity. We cheerfully admit that we are a body calling itself The Socialist Party of Great Britain. We presume to call ourselves that because as a matter of sober fact we are The Socialist Party of Great Britain! Our secretary is "a Mr. Lehané," who, as *Reynolds's* will be interested to know, we call Comrade Lehané. Also we are Socialist malcontents because there is no other way. If *Reynolds's* knows a Socialist who is not a malcontent we should be glad to see him. He would be worth going a long journey to view.

Having gone to this trouble to assure *Reynolds's Newspaper* on these points, perhaps we may now venture to ask a favour for ourselves. That it will be quite an easy request for an organ like *Reynolds's* to comply with we are quite ready to believe, although there does seem to be an incomprehensible number of apparently insurmountable difficulties in the way of other, less eminent, organs and persons satisfying our small requirements in the same regard. All we ask is that *Reynolds's* will be good enough to slightly abbreviate a few of its Divorce Court reports so that it may find an inch or two of its invaluable space for the publication of the evidence in support of the allegation it has made against us of having sent a misleading letter to Bebel and of largely occupying ourselves with abuse. We should be so much obliged for proof of either or both charges. Would, for example, the extracts from this paper which *Reynolds's* has often reproduced with approval contain the abuse? We are sorry to say that we cannot accept such allegations even from *Reynolds's* without some proof.

As it is we are compelled to admit that a complaint of abuse from *Reynolds's* comes as refreshingly humorous to us as its rather lumbering essays in irony. *Reynolds's* protesting against abuse is as if the Prince of Darkness protested against the heat!

THE SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

The Second Annual Conference of The Socialist Party of Great Britain will gather at

the Communist Club at Easter, to review the work of the year and draw from it the lessons which will enable us to avoid any mistakes of the past and perfect our organisation for the future. The delegates will find the Party stronger numerically than it ever was, and growing rapidly. The propaganda work being confined in the main to the metropolis, our progress has, of course, been made principally in the metropolitan area. Nevertheless, in most of the large and many of the small provincial centres we have now either members of the Party or subscribers to our official organ, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, and we think we are quite justified in saying that without being extravagantly sanguine over the matter, we have no doubt at all that the near future will show branches forming around the existing nucleus in those districts. At present Watford to the North and Bexley to the South stand as our Branch outposts. A year hence, with the maintenance of that enthusiasm and determination which have endured unaltered with our membership during the two years of our existence—and may therefore fairly be regarded now as constant and even an increasing quantity—and we shall surely be heard of further afield. We are young, but in our short two years of life not one single fact, not one isolated incident, has inspired a doubt in our mind as to the correctness of the attitude we have assumed in opposition to all other parties. On the contrary, everything has confirmed us in our faith, and demonstrated the dangers that attend even the slightest deviation from the line rigidly dictated by the conditions of the class struggle. We have seen how the most honest of men may only traverse these side-tracks and seeming short-cuts at the imminent risk of danger from the pitfalls and gins that beset them. We do not know of an instance where an honest man has escaped unscathed. Knowing therefore what we know, we may go forward with added confidence, satisfied that if our honest man remains honest he will, directly he has discovered his error, make all haste to extricate himself from the difficulties of the political *cul-de-sac* into which he has unwittingly strayed and follow after along the path of our progress. Let those who gibe at our youth (as though truth had any relation to old age) take what measure of poor consolation they may from their own decrepitude. Let those who sneer at our size (as though truth and bulk were interchangeable terms) make as merry in their hearts as they may. Time, whose inexorable advance none may stay, will cure us all too speedily of our youth, as it will cure our sneerers and gibbers of their delusions. For them there is nothing but a painful awakening or—dissolution. The future is with us. Therefore, Comrades of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, let us utilise the opportunity presented by our second Annual Conference to cement again our resolve to follow the straight track at whatever cost, and may our gathering together serve to inspire us, and nerve us, and strengthen our arm for the work which remains to be done before the last entrenchment of capitalism is rushed, the last rampart scaled, and the forces of Labour, so long held in subjection, come into their own.

IMPORTANT!

PLEASE NOTE—

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

BEBEL AND THE S.P.G.B.

A correspondence arising out of a telegram on the results of the Parliamentary elections, sent by the leader of the German Social Democratic Party to "Reynolds's Newspaper."

The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
1a, Caledonian Road, London, N.
17th February, 1906.

A. Bebel,
Per Adresse "Vorwaerts,"
68/9 Lindenstrasse,
Berlin.

Dear Comrade,

I am instructed by the Executive Committee to forward to you the enclosed cutting from *Reynolds's Newspaper* of Sunday, January 28th, 1906, containing text and translation of a telegram alleged to have been sent by you to the paper in question.

The Executive Committee will be glad if you will kindly state whether such a telegram was sent by you, and in the event of a telegram having been sent, whether it is correctly reproduced in the attached cutting.

Awaiting your reply,

Yours fraternally,
(Signed) C. Lehané,
General Secretary.

HERR BEBEL.

TO "REYNOLDS'S."

IMPORTANT TELEGRAM.
YESTERDAY.

Herr Bebel, the famous leader of the Social Democratic party in the German Parliament, sent a telegram yesterday to *Reynolds's Newspaper*, in reply to a request for his opinion on the results of the General Election. His reply was as follows:—

I welcome the result of the elections as a genuine sign of the desire of the British people for a friendly understanding in foreign affairs, and as a progressive development in domestic affairs. In any case the decision of the voting implies a cold douche for Jingoism with us and with you. On the other hand, with regard to the signs of progress in domestic affairs, I dare not, after old experiences, express an opinion until I know more.

German Imperial Parliament,
Berlin, February 20th, 1906.

Dear Comrade,

The telegram corresponds with the wording of that sent by me. By way of explanation I wish to state that concerning "progress internally" I have above all in mind possible progress in the amelioration of the working class position. Here I also regard the Liberal Party with distrust.

With fraternal greetings,
(Signed) A. Bebel.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
London, 9th March, 1906.

A. Bebel,
German Imperial Parliament,
Berlin.

Dear Comrade,

I am directed by the Executive Committee to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 20th ult. regarding your telegram to *Reynolds's Newspaper*.

The Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain wishes to enter its emphatic protest against your action in this matter. The opinion you expressed in the telegram is not in accord with the Socialist position in this country, as set forth in the manifesto (entitled "Why Vote?") issued by this Party in January last, copy enclosed. *Reynolds's Newspaper* is

a capitalist organ which has used your telegram against the Socialists and in support of the Liberals.

The Executive Committee regrets that occasion should have arisen to evoke this protest, but the sentiments to which you have given utterance in welcoming Liberalism to political power as an indication of progress in foreign or domestic affairs are such as to leave no other course open. Nationally and internationally there is but one Party to which we can look for progress, and that is the Socialist Party, but Socialism will triumph only by the overthrow of Liberalism in Britain and elsewhere.

Copies of this letter are being forwarded to the German Social-Democratic Party, International Socialist Bureau, and "Vorwaerts."

Yours fraternally,
(Signed) C. Lehané,
General Secretary.

Translated from "Vorwaerts" of March 15th, 1906.

Relating to this matter Comrade Bebel writes us:

Immediately on the conclusion of the English Parliamentary elections, I received a telegram from the Editorial Department of *Reynolds's Newspaper* requesting me to communicate to them my views concerning the result. For this purpose a prepaid telegram form that afforded me the scope of 120 words for my reply was placed at my disposal. As the character of *Reynolds's Newspaper* was known to me as that of a bourgeois paper, I at first entertained misgivings as to the advisability of sending a reply. Eventually I dispelled these doubts and sent off the telegram reprinted above.

But I am not a little astonished at the importance the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain attaches to my telegram. When describing the result of the English elections as designating a state of mind of the British people in favour of a peaceable development of affairs externally and conducive to progress internally, I could not, had I been dreaming, have understood by that only the result in favour of the Liberals, and could not possibly have overlooked the result of the elections in favour of the Socialist Party. The total effect of the elections has the result pointed out by me: the protest raised does not in any way alter my views, which may be characterised in three directions:

1. Definite disavowal of the protective tariff proposals of Mr. Chamberlain and his colleagues.
2. Renunciation of Jingoism and Chauvinism which have developed more and more under the Conservative regime.
3. Furtherance of progress in the social legislation of England, mainly due to the entrance of representatives of the Socialist Party into Parliament.

In the concluding sentence of my telegram, I certainly expressed distrust as to whether hopes of this kind would be realised in face of the Liberal majority in Parliament.

How the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain could gather from my telegram that I failed to recognise that real progress, internationally and at home, could only be achieved by Socialism, is also a riddle to me. Let no one ascribe to me what, in consideration of my past career, nobody dare impute.

I am not aware in what way *Reynolds's Newspaper* has used my telegram against my comrades in England. The loyal interpretation of my telegram that I had reason to expect from the Editorial Department of that journal would have made it impossible. If I have been mistaken in this respect, I am sorry.

(Signed) A. Bebel
Schoenberg Berlin, March 13th, 1906.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
1a, Caledonian Road, London, N.
22nd March, 1906.

To the Editors, "Vorwaerts," Berlin.

Dear Comrades,

The questions raised in the telegram sent by Comrade Bebel to *Reynolds's Newspaper* and further elaborated by our Comrade in his reply published by *Vorwaerts* to the protest which the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain felt constrained to enter, are of such serious importance to us here in England and we believe also to the whole international Socialist movement that the Executive Committee desires through the columns of *Vorwaerts* to deal with the position taken up by Comrade Bebel in this matter.

Let us say at the outset that far from desiring to inconsiderately impute to Comrade Bebel sentiments with his record as a fighter in the ranks of Socialism, it was with feelings of pain that we found it necessary to send our protest, recollecting as we did that it was Comrade Bebel who at the International Socialist Congress (Amsterdam, 1904) strongly supported the "Dresden Resolution" which decisively affirmed our tried and victorious policy based on the class struggle, condemned every attempt to mask the ever-growing class antagonisms, rejected all responsibility of any sort under political and economic conditions based on capitalist production, and discountenanced any measure tending to maintain the dominant class in power; but, having regard to the position laid down in the Dresden Resolution, we deemed it our imperative duty to call attention to an action, to which Comrade Bebel does not appear to attach much importance but to which *Reynolds's Newspaper* gave the greatest possible prominence, in the hope that we would in future be saved from the humiliation of seeing the lesson which we have been hard endeavouring to inculcate into the minds of the British working class repudiated by a prominent continental Comrade in the columns of one of the most dangerous organs of Capitalism in this country.

Here we wish to observe that although we called Comrade Bebel's attention to the manifesto ("Why Vote?") issued by The Socialist Party of Great Britain in January last, he has not even hinted at the truth or falsity of the arguments therein set forth. A correct comprehension of the nature of our protest is perhaps impossible unless the position taken up in that manifesto is known and appreciated.

Regarding the telegram which is the subject of this correspondence, there is absolutely nothing in it to suggest that the sender was a Socialist, and had it not been announced by *Reynolds's Newspaper* that the message had been sent by Comrade Bebel no one would have suspected that this was a pronouncement made by a recognized spokesman of Socialism. On the contrary, the telegram might well be supposed without taxing the imaginative faculty, to have been sent by an ordinary bourgeois radical. Indeed, far from crediting this message to have emanated from Comrade Bebel, and well knowing how erroneous it might be on our part to rely on the mere assertion of a journal like *Reynolds's Newspaper* that the published wording was the actual text of the telegram sent, we decided in the first instance to send direct to our Comrade the complete cutting from *Reynolds's Newspaper* in order that we might ascertain the authenticity and accuracy of the published message.

We received from Comrade Bebel a letter confirming the telegram and at the same time volunteering the information that as to "progress internally" he had particularly in mind possible progress in the betterment of the position of the working class. The fact that our Comrade thought it necessary to explain a certain part of his telegram would seem to indicate that he himself realised that his message was not explicit in at least this particular, and the further fact that in his statement already published in *Vorwaerts* he introduced matters not referred to in the telegram serves to show that he recognises the incompleteness of the position he at first laid down.

In his reply to our letter published in *Vorwaerts* Comrade Bebel states that his telegram described the result of the English elections as designating a state of mind of the British people; to this we have raised no objection but

we would point out that what we have called attention to was that the telegram also indicated on the part of Comrade Bebel a state of mind which was, in our opinion, unsatisfactory in so far as it "welcomed" as a sign of progress that result. The concluding sentence of the telegram did certainly express doubt as to whether the expectations of progress would be fulfilled, but similar doubts and in stronger language have been more than once expressed by *Reynolds's Newspaper* itself. That, however, does not prove the Editor of *Reynolds's Newspaper* to be a Socialist. Surely, we are justified in expecting from our comrade an expression of opinion which would convey something more than a doubt as to the power or inclination of the Liberal Party of Capitalism to ameliorate the condition of the working class? The members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain at any rate entertain no doubts on the matter. British Liberalism is an enemy, and we expect nothing from an enemy but hostility.

Comrade Bebel avers that in sending his telegram he had in mind not merely the result in favour of the Liberals, but also the result in favour of the Socialist Party. Here the result of the elections is regarded as an overwhelming triumph for Liberalism or Radicalism, and as the telegram did not contain any reference to Socialism, it was open to the reader to understand that our Comrade sympathised with the Radical victory. We have again perused the telegram and find our impressions in no way altered. In this connection it is well to point out that it is a common practice among capitalist journals in Britain to describe German Socialism as a bourgeois Radical movement, and when we here preach the class struggle they tell us that we are not in accord with the German movement.

In the issue of *Reynolds's Newspaper* containing Comrade Bebel's telegram, an editorial article in the column preceding that which was boldly headed by the telegram, points out that "a Socialist in theory is a Radical in practice," and the publication of the telegram as an "important" message was calculated to support this position. In that issue, also, is reproduced part of our "Why Vote?" manifesto, and the obvious contradiction between our advice to the working class to abstain from voting altogether in the last General Election (on the grounds that every candidate appealing for their votes was a conscious or unconscious supporter of capitalism and that, therefore, whatever the result, it could not be beneficial to them, and the position taken up by Comrade Bebel whose telegram greeted the result as an auspicious sign of progress, was just the kind of thing which has in the past been used to our detriment by the British Radical press.

Our Comrade says he cannot imagine how we could have thought he did not recognise that genuine progress could be achieved except by Socialism, but there is no mention of Socialism in the telegram and the victory of the Liberal Party is the only result referred to.

Regarding Comrade Bebel's views with reference to the result of the British elections, we wish to make the following comments:

1. We agree that it might be described as an expression of determination to uphold the Free Trade system. In view, however, of the fact that as admitted by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman the head of the Liberal and Free Trade Government, there are in Britain to-day thirteen millions of the working class on the verge of starvation although the Free Trade regime has been established for sixty years, it can scarcely be claimed that the workers have much to congratulate themselves upon. As Comrade Bebel knows, it is difficult to say which are the worst off, the workers of Protectionist America or Free Trade Britain. In Germany where Feudalism is still far from being extinct there doubtless exist reasons for interesting the workers in questions of tariff, but here in Britain where industrial Capitalism enjoys full sway, such reasons are inapplicable. Hence we tell the working class that questions of tariff do not affect them.

2. If the elections showed a desire on the part of the British people to renounce jingoism, it is a curious fact that in foreign affairs it is the avowed intention of the Liberal Cabinet to continue the policy of the late Tory Government. On the very day that Reuter's Berlin telegram containing Comrade Bebel's view as

to the abandonment of Jingoism in England was published, there also appeared in the English press the announcement of the refusal of the British Secretary for War to reduce the standing army which is still on the same footing as it was during the South African War. In this refusal the Government were supported by such "Socialist" Members of Parliament as P. Snowden, D. J. Shackleton and W. Crooks. Indeed, there has been no slackening of Jingoism either during or after the elections. Comrade Bebel has apparently mistaken Liberal professions for Liberal performances. They profess to be the party of peace, but historical records show that more wars have been carried on in the name of the British nation while the Liberal Party have been in power than while the Tories have held office.

3. We absolutely deny the accuracy of our Comrade's assertion that progress is to be expected in the social legislation of England due to the entrance into Parliament of representatives of the Socialist Party. Not a single Socialist candidate was elected. It is not at all clear what Comrade Bebel has in mind when he speaks of the "Socialist Party," but if he refers to the Labour Representation Committee, which is the organisation that returned the so-called Independent Labour members, we wish to inform our Comrade that this organisation declines to recognise any Socialist candidate: it has no principles, no program, and merely a constitution which states that their members shall be independent of the other political parties. The Independent Labour Party, which ran its candidates under the auspices of the Labour Representation Committee, repudiates

the class struggle see their press. J. Keir Hardie, Chairman of the Labour Party in Parliament, denies the class struggle, and J. Ramsay MacDonald, Secretary of the Labour Representation Committee and Parliamentary Whip of the Labour Party, has recently written a book entitled "Socialism and Society," published by the Independent Labour Party, repudiating the class struggle and ranking Karl Marx as the last of the Utopian Socialists. Those candidates claiming to be Socialists and recognised as such by the International Socialist Congress or International Socialist Bureau, and who were elected, did not stand as Socialists—they are part and parcel of the non-Socialist Labour Party. The Social Democratic Federation, which is claimed by *Reynolds's Newspaper* to be "the only genuine Socialistic organisation in the Kingdom," did not secure the return of a single Socialist candidate.

The Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain notes that Comrade Bebel recognises that genuine progress in both domestic and international affairs can be achieved only by the Socialist Party, but regrets that he did not remove any possibility of misconception by utilising for the specific indication of this belief the remaining scope of the one hundred and twenty words prepaid by *Reynolds's Newspaper*. Had he done this, the London organ of bourgeois democracy would be unlikely to have given his message the prominence it did.

The Executive Committee of
The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
(Signed) C. LEANE,
General Secretary.

THE VALOUR OF DISCRETION.

THE SOUTHEM S.D.F. PREFERS TO APE BRER RABBIT.

In our January number we referred to and answered certain charges made against the Socialist Party of Great Britain by Mr. Doody, speaking for the Southend Branch of the Social Democratic Federation. These charges were the only answer Mr. Doody appears to have been able to make to questions touching the confusing and unsatisfactory tactics of the S.D.F., which were put to him at a public meeting by our Comrade Rogers. As we were, without difficulty, able to shew, the charges were as devoid of foundation as the allegation that Mr. Doody fully understands the only logical position a Socialist Party can adopt. But as Mr. Doody proceeded to challenge our Comrade Fitzgerald to public debate (in an exuberance doubtless born of the knowledge that Fitzgerald was many miles away), we were content to leave the further presentation of our case in justification of our position to the S.D.F. and all other similar capitalist adjuncts in the hands of Fitzgerald, confident of his ability to supply those inhabitants of Southend interested in the matter with all the evidence they might require.

Since then, we have been endeavouring to induce the Southend S.D.F. to give effect to the challenge their champion threw out. We publish the correspondence below from which it will be seen that after much hesitation, they elected to deprive Southend of the pleasure of hearing a local character—as we understand Mr. Doody is—attempts to demolish our case. We can only assume that having some not unnatural misapprehension on this score, they sought to stave off possible catastrophe (and us) by proposing to transfer the discussion from Southend to London. But we are always glad of the opportunity a debate offers to vindicate our position to the working class, and we accepted the changed venue. Since when we can get no further communication from them.

This seems to be a case of a challenge in haste repeated at leisure and we ask the workers of Southend where we are pleased to know The Socialist Standard has a very good circulation—to observe what manner of men our opponents are and what manner of method they pursue.

The point that Mr. Doody issued the challenge is, it will be seen, disputed, but as our Comrade Rogers sends details of the incidents leading

up to the challenge and has a clear recollection of the whole matter, there seems little doubt that Mr. Doody's memory is faulty. However, the point is probably in the minds of the audience of the meeting referred to, and need not be laboured.

1a, Caledonian Road, London, N.
December 27th, 1906.

Dear Comrade,

We are informed by our member Miss Laura Rogers, that a member of the Southend Branch of the Social Democratic Federation, viz., Mr. Thomas Doody, has publicly expressed his desire to meet our comrade John Fitzgerald in public debate and I shall, therefore, feel obliged if you will inform me as soon as possible, as I understand that you are the Secretary of the Southend Branch of the S.D.F., what proposals you have to make with respect to the challenge. Yours fraternally, R. H. Kent,

Asst. Sec.

Mr. S. Howard,
Point Loma, Cromer Road,
Southend-on-Sea.

1a, Caledonian Road, London, N.
January 17th, 1906.

Dear Comrade,

Will you kindly favor us with an early reply to our letter of the 27th December last, respecting the public challenge issued by your Mr. Thomas Doody to debate with our Comrade Fitzgerald. Yours fraternally, R. H. Kent,

Asst. Sec.

Mr. S. Howard,
Point Loma, Cromer Road,
Southend-on-Sea.

Point Loma, Cromer Road,
Southend-on-Sea.
Jan'y 20th, 1906.

R. H. Kent,

Asst. Sec'y.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Dear Comrade,

In reply to your letter dated the 17th inst. (to hand last night), I wrote a letter to your office on the 18th inst., but not having your

letter of the 27th ulto. before me, I inadvertently addressed it to "Miss Kate Hagkins" as Assistant Sec'y. However, the following is a copy of it:

"I much regret the delay in acknowledging the receipt of your letter of some days ago, with reference to a proposed debate. The question put to Mr. T. Doody by your Miss L. Rogers was, 'Are you prepared to defend the tactics of the S.D.F.' to which the reply 'Yes' was given; and I am instructed to inform you that he is prepared to do so at any time, and anywhere, in London."

Yours fraternally,
S. Howard,
Branch Sec'y, S.D.F.

1a, Caledonian Road, London, N.
24th January, 1906.

Mr. S. Howard,

Secretary,

Southend Branch, Social Democratic Federation,
Point Loma,

Cromer Road,

Southend-on-Sea.

Dear Comrade,

I am directed by the Executive Committee to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 20th inst., and in doing so to express their very great surprise at the attempt to change the venue of the proposed debate from Southend to London. They instruct me to point out that the challenge arose out of a public meeting held at Southend under the auspices of the Southend Branch of the Social Democratic Federation, and was accepted by Mr. T. Doody who we presume, was your accredited representative at that meeting.

My Executive, therefore, see no reason why the debate should not be held in Southend, and they suggest that it would not be fair to the members of the public who were present at your meeting when the challenge was given and accepted, if they were deprived of the opportunity of hearing the differences between us fully discussed.

I am accordingly instructed to make the following definite proposals to you:

That the debate between Mr. T. Doody, representing the Southend Branch of the Social Democratic Federation, and our comrade J. Fitzgerald, representing the Executive Committee of this Party, should be held in a public hall at Southend at as early a date as can conveniently be arranged:

That admission to the meeting shall be free—that it shall be well advertised by means of posters and handbills; and that the total expense shall be borne equally between yourselves and this Party.

Kindly favour me with an early reply, so that arrangements can be made without delay.

Yours fraternally,
R. H. Kent,
Asst. Sec.

Social Democratic Federation,
Southend-on-Sea Branch,
Southchurch Road,
Feb. 1st, 1906.

Dear Comrade,

Your letter of the 24th ulto. received, and the same shall be laid before my Branch on the 7th inst.

Yours fraternally,
S. Howard,
Branch Sec.

Social Democratic Federation,
Southend-on-Sea Branch,
Southchurch Road,
Sunday, Feb. 18th, 1906.

The Secretary,

Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Comrade,

I reply to your communication of the 21st January. I am instructed to say that my Committee do not see that any good can be gained by having a debate here. Your Party has no branch, and under all the circumstances, if the debate is to take place, it must, as stated in a previous letter to you, be somewhere in London where you have a branch or branches.

Yours fraternally,
P. Pro Branch Committee,
J. Adams.

1a, Caledonian Road, London, N.
24th Feb., 1906.
Mr. J. Adams,
Southend-on-Sea Branch,
Social Democratic Federation,
Southchurch Road,
Southend-on-Sea.

Dear Comrade,

Your letter of the 18th inst. was laid before the Executive Committee on Tuesday last, and in reply I am instructed to inform you that the correspondence will be published.

I am further directed to state that the E.C. accepts your offer to debate in London, also your offer to debate in Southend as soon as a Branch of this Party is formed in Southend.

Please let us know the dates on which your Mr. Doody could come to London, in order that arrangements may be made for the debate here.

Yours fraternally,
C. Leane,
General Secretary.

THE ENFRANCHISEMENT OF WOMEN.

To the Editor of

"The Socialist Standard."

Dear Sir: May I appeal to your readers, men who have fought and won a great victory for Labour, to stand by the women who have now begun in earnest their struggle for political existence?

Working women realise at last that just as Labour men had to agitate and fight to secure their right to be represented in the State, so they must now agitate and fight to win their enfranchisement for the sake of their homes and their children—for the sake of justice and honour.

Our experience of every agitation for a wider suffrage is that at the last moment women have been left out of the question. We want first to get sex disability abolished, and then to work with all those who desire a broader basis of democratic representation, and a fuller measure of social reform. We shall welcome very gladly all the help we can get from men, and we hope to collect a fund that shall enable us to carry out an organised, vigorous campaign.

Yours etc.,
EMILINE PETHICK LAWRENCE,
Hon. Treasurer,
Women's Social and Political Union,
Central London Committee.

We do not hold the recent election of "Labour" men to Parliament to be a victory for Labour. In our March issue it was shown to be a victory for confusion.

For the rest Mrs. Pethick Lawrence has reversed what we regard as the correct order of things, and it is for precisely this reason that we are opposed to all the reform school of politicians, whose method is to focus attention upon some supposed ameliorative measure in the hope that by it they may be advanced one step, more or less short, on the road to a more or less distant goal. The goal is subordinate to the steps. We claim that by crystallizing attention on the goal the possibility of losing our way among a multitude of steps is obviated. It is the goal that matters.

On the question of women's franchise, for instance, it is the step that concerns Mrs. Lawrence. The goal is a very indistinct and shadowy "fuller measure of social reform."

Our goal is Socialism. We know that the working class cannot obtain Socialism 'til they understand their class position and the reasons why Socialism alone will materially benefit them. It is our business, therefore, to instruct them so far as we may in their class position and in Socialism. When they understand; when they are class-conscious, they will fight with us for Socialism. Short of that there is nothing that will avail. The fact that they strive for something less is proof positive that they are not class-conscious. We have therefore class-conscious workers to deal with, and if we harness their untutored spirit of revolt to the chariot wheel of reform, we are simply deluding them and wasting energies which might just as well and just as easily be focussed upon the essential Socialism.

Therefore we are not concerned with electoral reform, howbeit we are of necessity Universal Adult Suffragists. The present franchise which gives the male workers sufficient power to effect any purpose, has been utilised to maintain capitalist domination in politics. That is to say the working class vote has been used by the working class against working-class interests—why? Because of working-class ignorance. To an ignorant working class, therefore, the weapon of the vote is useless. Only an intelligent working class can use that weapon to working-class advantage. Why are the workers ignorant? We reply because to a considerable extent their energies have been consumed in unimportant reform negotiations such as that of the women's franchise. How may their ignorance be dispelled? We answer, by Socialists telling them the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, particularly the class truth.

And the whole truth is that the extension of the franchise to women is not an important matter; that the important matter is working-class consciousness—the full appreciation of the absolute and irreconcilable hostility of interest existing between the capitalist class and the working class. When that has been achieved and the workers have organised themselves into a political force translating their industrial antagonism to the capitalist class into political antagonism to all the political forces of capital—which would, of course, be the necessary and inevitable result of class-consciousness, the extension of the franchise to cover women workers and that great body of at-present voteless males, will be effected without difficulty. If, indeed, in the process of organisation, the capitalist class, dismayed by the determination of a rapidly growing working-class party to be satisfied with nothing less than the extinction of capitalism itself, have not enacted a measure of complete enfranchisement in the hope that it might side-track the movement, or at any rate, stay its progress temporarily. If there is one fact that obtrudes upon the attention of students of industrial history more than another it is that the larger the demand preferred by organised determination, the larger the concessions made. We do not, therefore, demand the half-loaf, if it is a half-loaf of a woman's vote, nor even the whole loaf as they regard it of the more advanced reformer. We demand the whole baker's shop of Socialism, and it is our business to endeavour to harness the might of the working class to our demand. We have hitched our waggon to a star, and we do not propose to unclip.

The text for Mrs. Pethick Lawrence and for all who earnestly desire working-class emancipation should be, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Socialism and its righteousness, and all the other things will be added unto you."

We hope we have without offence made it clear why we cannot respond to the appeal made for help. We have important work to do.

THE NEED FOR "INTELLECTUALS."

It is often asserted by the geniuses of the Fabian Society and other middle-class mis-leaders of the working class, that the workers to-day, and in the future, require the assistance and guidance of educated, intelligent, middle-class men, both to direct their agitation and energies now, and to manipulate municipal and national affairs in the future. The workers, therefore, should not endeavour to obtain control of the political machinery themselves, but should place the "intellectual experts" in that position and obey their behests.

This, of course, is merely the old conservative idea of "Divine Right and a Class to Rule" presented in new terms. Those who carry on all the complicated and interdependent processes of wealth production from top to bottom, who delve the ore, smelt the metal, lay the railways, cut the canals, manipulate and direct enormous engines and instruments in industry, who erect structures greater than the Pyramids and more wonderful than the Gardens of Babylon, these workers, according to the agents of the ruling class, are incapable, too ignorant, not sufficiently equipped with organising power, to manage these forces on their own behalf and for their

own well-being. Hence the need for "experts" to do it for them.

But with all their care and caution, the capitalists' henchmen sometimes forget to speak by the book. Thus Mr. Chiozza Money, in the *Daily News*, Feb. 16th, comments upon the reception given to the deputation on Old Age Pensions that waited upon the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and were told that these intellectual giants knew not where to obtain the money for these pensions. "As I have so often pointed out," says Mr. Money, "it is not a case that there is any doubt as to where the money is to come from, and I am sorry that the members of the deputation were not prepared to address themselves effectually to the question of ways and means." And he hopes any further deputation will deal exhaustively with the financial side of the matter.

Mr. Money is somewhat new in the political field. Apparently he is somewhat of a novice in the business of misleading the workers for the benefit of his paymasters, though he has learnt some of the tricks of deliberate falsification of history, as Blatchford showed in a controversy between them on the Liberals and Trade Unions. The old hand would not have "let the cat out of the bag" so completely as Mr. Money has done in pointing out how it is desirable, nay, the duty of the workers, not only to produce and distribute wealth, but also to instruct their superiors how to carry on the business of swindle and sweat.

We may thank Mr. Money for adding his quota to the mass of evidence we already possess, showing the incapability to control, and the want of power to direct, the giant forces of production that have outgrown the power of the modern ruling class to control, and that need a reorganization of Society to bring them into harmony.

For if the workers are, in addition to producing all the wealth, to instruct their masters in all the details of administration, then it at once follows that they may just as well do the whole business for their own benefit. Why trouble to elect "experts," either financial or economic, if these geniuses have to be shown what to do by those whose superiors they are supposed to be? Forty years ago Karl Marx completely exploded the "Captains of Industry" nonsense in his masterly way; and Engels and Lafargue, among others, have pointed out the facts around us, illustrating the intellectual bankruptcy of the ruling class. Mr. Money, by his advice quoted above, shows first how he recognises these truths, and secondly how much of a novice he still is at the game of Bunkum.

J. FITZGERALD.

MORE CONFUSION.

We have before us a copy of the Agenda for the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the United Government Workers' Federation, which was held on the 15th and 16th of March: a document that illustrates very clearly the confusion existing in the minds of the workers as to the class struggle.

The Agenda consists of about 50 Resolutions on Education—these are tucked away at the bottom of the Agenda and consist of something less than the familiar list of pious aspirations on the subject usually voiced at the Trades Union Congress. The Executive put forward a motion congratulating local organisations on the return of Messrs. Crooks, Bowerman and Jenkins and regretting the failure of Messrs. Quelch and Saunders. And another congratulating the Labour M.P.'s and asking them to ballot for motions for bringing the question of improving the position of State employees before the House of Commons.

Nearly all the rest of the Agenda consists of Resolutions "calling on," "urging," "respectfully urging," "requesting," the Government to concede some special points interesting one or other of the local organisations. These or similar motions have doubtless been passed hundreds of times before by working class assemblies with exactly the same result—just nothing at all. How much longer will the workers continue to beg cringingly, each little section for itself, instead of boldly standing up as a class and taking what is their own.

A.R.A.M.

Printed by Jacob & Bros., 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

S.P.G.B. North London District Council.

DURING APRIL LECTURES

WILL BE GIVEN AS USUAL.

S.P.G.B. BATTERSEA BRANCH.

SYDNEY HALL 36, YORK ROAD, BATTERSEA.

April 8th—E. J. B. ALLEN:
"Revolution."
15th—T. A. JACKSON:
"Cant and Compromise."

Chair at 7.30 sharp. Discussion.
ALL ARE INVITED.

The Open-air Propaganda will commence
on Sunday, April 22nd.

THE SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE

OF The Socialist Party of Great Britain

WILL BE HELD ON
Good Friday & Sat., 13 & 14 April, 1906

AT THE
COMMUNIST CLUB, 107, Charlotte St.,
Fitzroy Square, LONDON, W.

Commencing at 10 a.m. each day.

A "SOCIAL"
will be held on Good Friday,
7.30 p.m.

AT THE SAME ADDRESS.

Admission Free. Members and Friends invited.

Branch Secretaries and others
SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as
well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE
28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

BEXLEY & DISTRICT.—R. A. V. Morris, Sec., Oxshott, Warren Rd., Bexley Heath. Branch meets Wednesdays at Sec's House at 8. Public Meetings, Market Place, Bexley Heath, Sundays at 8.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—G. Wilson, Sec., 14, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets every Saturday at 8.30 at above address.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Anty, Secretary, 360, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Sundays at 3.30.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 309, North End Road, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—T. Bennett, Sec., 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Tuesdays at 8.30 at the Co-op. Stores, 79, Grove Rd., Holloway.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m. at the Branch Rooms, 29, The Parade, Tooting, which are open to members and friends every evening.

TOTTENHAM.—G. Young, Secretary, 14, Rosebery Gardens, Harringay, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8 o'clock at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Sq., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 19, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND

WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Vol. I. Bound) 3s. 0d.

MANIFESTO and RULES of the

S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES' BOY ... 1½d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST

(Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION

(Kautsky) 6½d.

ALL POST FREE.

VOL. I.

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Well bound in stiff boards.

Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be sent to Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 21. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, MAY, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE
SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

CONTINUED FROM FEB. ISSUE.

The Extinction of Petty Enterprise.

By KARL KAUTSKY.

Translated from the German by H. J. NEWMAN and revised by the Author.

3. THE CAPITALIST MODE OF PRODUCTION.

In the course of the Middle Ages handicraft developed more and more in Europe; division of labour in society increased, weaving for instance being split up into wool weaving, linen weaving and flannel weaving, and several processes connected with weaving, such as cloth trimming, became separate trades. Skill increased and the methods and tools of production were considerably improved. At that time commerce developed, mainly in consequence of improvements in the means of transit, particularly the advance of shipbuilding.

Four hundred years ago handicraft was at its height. This was also an eventful time for commerce. The over-sea route to India, this fairyland full of immeasurable treasure, was found, and America with its inexhaustible store of gold and silver was discovered. A flood of wealth which European adventurers had amassed in the newly discovered countries by commerce, fraud and robbery, was poured out over Europe. The lion's share of this wealth fell to the merchants, who were in a position to equip ships and man them with a numerous, powerful crew, whose members were as daring as they were unscrupulous.

At the same time also developed the modern state, the centralised state of officialdom and militarism, first of all in the form of absolute monarchy. This state met the requirements of the expanding capitalist class, just as it needed their support. The modern state, the state of the developed production of commodities, does not obtain its strength from personal services but from its financial income. The monarchs had, therefore, every reason to protect and to favour those who brought money into the country, viz., the merchants, the capitalists. In return for this protection the capitalists lent money to the monarchs, to the states, made them their debtors, subjected them to dependence on them and thus forced the state, in order to serve capitalist interests, to safeguard and extend traffic routes, acquire and retain colonies abroad, make wars against rival commercial states, and so on.

Our elementary economic primers tell us that the origin of capital lies in thrift, but we have just now observed altogether different sources of capital. The vast amount of wealth of the capitalist nations can be traced back to their colonial policy, that is to their plundering of foreign countries; it can be traced back to piracy, smuggling, slave traffic and commercial wars. Up to the present century, the history of these nations furnishes us with sufficient examples of such methods of obtaining capital by "thrift," and the assistance of the state proved a powerful means of enhancing this "thrift."

But the new discoveries and roads of commerce did not only yield great wealth to the merchants; they also rapidly extended the markets for the products of industry of the seafaring nations in Europe, particularly of the

industry of England, which became the ruler of the sea. Handicraft was unable to satisfy the rapidly and extensively growing demand of the markets. Sales on a large scale demanded production on a large scale. The large market demanded production which entirely answered to its requirements, that is to say, a scale of production which could be undertaken only by the merchants.

The merchants were greatly interested in establishing production on a large scale to meet the extension of the markets; moreover, they were possessed of the financial means required to purchase in necessary quantities everything needed for production, raw material, tools, workshops, labour power. But whence was the latter obtained? Slaves that one could purchase no longer existed in Europe. A workman who possessed his own means of production or belonged to a family possessing the necessary means of production, would not sell his labour power. He preferred working for himself and his family so that the whole product of his labour should be his or that of his family. He sold the product of his labour, but not his labour power. Here it must be pointed out that one should beware of the expression "selling one's labour." Labour, an activity, cannot be sold. The word labour, however, is commonly not only used for the purpose of signifying an activity, but also for the purpose of designating the result of this activity, the labour product, and for describing labour power the expression of which is the activity in production. This application of the word labour enables all those economists who wish to leave the workers and the petty bourgeoisie in ignorance as to their condition, to mix up things and make them very much alike. This means that we have to watch these gentlemen very closely.

But let us return to the merchant whom we left in search of workers. The owners of petty industrial concerns and their families were of no use. The merchants had to look for workers who did not possess means of production, who possessed nothing but their labour power so that they were compelled to sell this in order to live. The development of the production of commodities and of private property had already brought into existence such men without property, as we have seen. There were, however, but few of them in the beginning, and most of them, unless they belonged to the family circle of a petty concern, were either unfit for work, cripples, invalids, old men, or men afraid of work, sharpers, and tramps. The number of workers without property and free to sell themselves was very small.

At that time, however, when there was a great demand for workers without property, kind Providence played its part by causing a large number of workers to be expropriated and turned into the streets, there to be readily picked up by the wealthy merchants. This was also the consequence of the development in the production of commodities. The extension of

the markets for urban industry had a reflex upon agriculture. In the towns a demand for articles of food, raw material, timber, wool, flax, dye stuffs, etc., increased, hence agricultural production too became more and more production of commodities, production for the purpose of selling.

The peasant got money into his hands, but that proved his misfortune, for it roused the avarice of his exploiters, the landlords and rulers. So long as his surplus had consisted only of natural product they had not taken therefrom more than they needed for their own consumption. Money, however, they could always make use of, the more the better. The more the market extended for the peasant and the more money he obtained for his goods, the more he was skinned by his landlords and rulers and the higher rose his taxes and duties. Soon his masters were no longer satisfied with the surplus over and above the cost of the peasant's subsistence, they filched even his necessities. No wonder that the peasants were seized with despair and that many of them, especially after all attempts at resistance in the Peasant war had been crushed, left hearth and home and sought refuge in the towns.

Then another circumstance often arose. As in the towns through the extension of the market the necessity for industrial production on a large scale made itself felt, so developed the need for agricultural production on a large scale. What the merchants endeavoured to do in the towns, the landowners sought in the country. The landowner, who until then had been as a rule only a peasant in a large way, tried to extend his farm, and as he knew how to force the peasants to enter his service, he did not lack an ample supply of labourers; often he did not need fresh workers. The production of wool or timber, pasture farming or forestry required far less workers than agriculture. Where the landowners gave up agriculture in favour of pasture farming or forestry they made agricultural labourers superfluous. But what the landowner was now above all in need of was more land than he had possessed until then, and this he could secure only at the expense of the peasants in his immediate vicinity. He had to drive them off their farms if he wished to extend his own, and he suffered no pang of conscience in pursuing such a course. The hunting down of peasants began and continued on a large scale until a century ago. Whilst the merchants enriched themselves by the exploitation of the colonies, the aristocracy and the rulers amassed wealth by exploiting their own subjects. And the feudal lords shewed as little reluctance as the capitalists in using fraud and physical force, robbery and incendiarism whenever they seemed necessary for gaining their ends. History thus teaches us most peculiar methods of "thrift."

What were the crowds of agriculturists without property to do, after having fled to escape taxes or duties or having been driven from hearth and home by fraud and violence? They were no longer able to produce for themselves, as they were lacking the means of production from which they had been driven and divorced. Being no longer in a position to take commodities to the market, nothing remained for them but to take themselves there, to sell the only thing of value that had been left to them, their labour power, for a short or long period, that is to say, their services were hired for wages. Some took employment as agricultural labourers, sometimes with the same master that had driven them out of their homes. Others joined the army to assist in the robbing expeditions of their masters who had plundered them. Others became submerged in beggary or crime. But many, and probably not the worst of them, turned to industrial enterprise for employment. The handicraftsmen endeavoured to stave off the deluge of additional labour, of fresh competitors, by restricting the entry into their trade guilds. This course of action, however, more readily forced the crowds of men deprived of every shred of property into the arms of the merchants who were seeking wage workers for their industrial undertakings. Thus was created the basis of capitalist industry, of capitalist production, by expropriation, by a revolution unparalleled in history for its bloodshed and cruelty. But, of course, it was a revolution of the rich and mighty against the

weak and poor, and for that reason the period of that revolution is cherished as the era of humanitarianism and intellectual freedom, and to-day, strange to say, most of all by those who are loudest in proclaiming their horror at the revolutionary intentions of Socialism.

The divorcement of large masses of workers from their means of production, their being deprived of all property and thus becoming proletarians was essentially a presupposed condition of capitalist production on a large scale. The economic development demanded it. But as always, the ruling classes were also in this instance not content with calmly watching the self-created effect of this development, but they resorted to physical force to safeguard their interests and thereby hasten the course of development, and it was physical force in its most brutal and most cruel form which assisted in the birth of capitalist society.

1. THE DEATH STRUGGLE OF PETTY ENTERPRISE.

Externally, the new method of production differed at first but very slightly from the old. Its original form was that the capitalist supplied the workers whom he had hired, his wage-workers, with raw material, for instance, with yarn in the case of weavers, which they worked up at home in order to deliver up the product to the capitalist. Of course, already in this form, which was the nearest approach to handicraft, capitalist production marked a vast difference between the handicraftsman on his own account and the wage worker producing in his home. We intend to consider later the change in the position of the worker caused by the new method of production, and shall, therefore, here deal only with the development of the latter.

The capitalist next ceased to allow the workers to perform the work in their own homes. He made them work in his workshops where he was better able to watch and drive them. This first of all created the basis of the real industrial capitalist enterprise on a large scale, and also the basis for that evolution of methods of production which has since been going forward with ever more rapid pace. Only by many working together in the workshop was division of labour made possible in production. Under the reign of petty enterprise division of labour had caused an increase in the number of trades and a decrease in the variety of articles which each producer made. But each one produced an entire article. Division of labour in bakeries for instance meant that each baker no longer produced every kind of bread. Some produced only white bread, others only brown bread. But every one produced whole loaves of bread. Division of labour in large concerns, however, has the effect of distributing the various processes necessary to the production of an article amongst certain workers who are working into each other's hands. The individual worker is more and more limited to a few single processes, which he repeats continually. A large concern where production is carried on in this way is a manufactory. The productivity of the labour of each individual worker is thereby increased. But another effect has proved to be of still greater importance. The division of labour in a particular trade having progressed so far as to divide the production of one article into its simplest processes and to reduce the worker to a mere machine, the replacing of the worker by a machine was only a small step.

And this step was taken. It was favoured by the development of natural science, above all, by the discovery of the motive power of steam, which for the first time provided a power quite independent of the elements and entirely subservient to man.

The introduction of the machine into industry signified an economic revolution. Through it the large capitalist concern obtained its highest and most perfect form, the manufactory. In the machine capitalist production was given its mightiest weapon, which easily conquered all resistance and made the course of economic development a great triumph of capital.

In the Seventies of the Eighteenth Century the first practical machines were invented. They were introduced into the textile industry in England. From that period also dates the invention of the steam engine. Thenceforth the machine conquered one industry after another. Up to the forties of the last century capitalist

industrialism outside of England was insignificant. In the fifties it developed extensively in France; in the sixties and particularly in the seventies it conquered the United States, Germany and Austria. In the course of the last decades it has seized even upon barbaric Russia, East India and Australia. It already begins to spread to Eastern Asia, South Africa and South America. What are the great world empires of past centuries compared with this gigantic empire which capitalist industrialism has succeeded in subjecting to its domination?

In 1837 there were in Prussia for industrial purposes 123 steam engines, with 7,500 horse power. In 1901, however, there were 70,832 such machines alone permanently installed, and the horse power in industry and agriculture in Prussia comprised over 4,000,000.

The work performed by the steam power of all the steam engines in the world was more than ten years ago estimated to be equal to that of 200 million horses and 1000 million men.

By the use of the steam engine, the entire mode of production has undergone constant evolution. One invention, one discovery superseded another. On the one hand, the machine conquered new fields which hitherto had remained reserved for handicraft. On the other hand, in branches of industry already subjected to the factory system, old machines are every day becoming superfluous owing to the introduction of new and more capable appliances; indeed, by new inventions, new trades are quite suddenly created and old ones doomed to extinction. Already thirty years ago a worker on a spinning machine produced a hundred times the amount of a woman's product by hand, and according to the statistics of the Department of Labour in Washington, the capacity of the machine in the textile industry had in 1898 become 163 times greater than that of hand work. The machine was already then producing in 19 hours and 7 minutes as much yarn (1 cwt.) as a woman could produce by hand in 3,117 hours and 30 minutes.

Of what significance can be the petty enterprise of the craftsman placed beside the industry aided by machines?

Even in its lowest stage, that of the industry carried on at home and exploited by the capitalist, capitalist enterprise is proved superior to the handicraft enterprise. We do not here take into consideration the fact that the former leads to specialisation, which naturally enhances the productivity of labour. Far more important is the advantage which the capitalist as merchant has over the handicraftsman. He buys his raw material and other means of production on a large scale, he surveys the market far more perfectly than the handicraftsman, understands far better how to take advantage of the moment to buy cheaply and sell dearly and he also possesses the means to wait for this psychological moment, and thus the advantage of the capitalist over the handicraftsman becomes so great that the latter cannot maintain the competition, even in the industries carried on at home, when production on a large scale, production for commercial purposes, comes into question. Even in those branches of industry in which handicraft performed in the home of the worker is the only prevailing method of production, the independence of the worker ceases when these become export industries. To change handicraft into an export industry means to destroy handicraft, to change it into home industry exploited by the capitalist. One can see how "artful" those social reformers are who wish to save a threatened industry by extending the markets for its products.

Thus, from its beginning, capitalist production, although quite simple, has proved in the case of production on a large scale superior to handicraft. The machine makes this superiority completely crushing.

Handicraft survives only in those industries where it is not yet a question of production on a large scale, but one of petty production for a market still limited.

But the machine has not only changed industry but also the means of transit. Steamers and railways reduce more and more the freights on goods, establish further communication between the remotest and most secluded places and the centres of industry, and extend from day to day the markets for each of these centres. Only in this way is the full development of the

machine in industry possible. The tremendous increase of production caused by the introduction of machinery demands also a proportionate increase in the disposal of the products.

In the same measure in which the means of transit are extended and perfected, in the same measure in which the market for particular industries is widened, by that same degree is the scope of handicraft getting limited. The number of trades and places where handicraft is still able to exist is already inconsiderable and diminishing perceptibly. The factory prevails and the days of handicraft are passing away.

But what holds good with handicraft applies also, if not in equal measure, to peasant farming. Wherever agriculture, whether on a small or large scale, has become production of commodities, production for sale, not for use, the large enterprise even if not more capable possesses from the beginning the same advantage over the petty enterprise which the capitalist has over the handicraftsman, namely, a better understanding and control of the market. The large landowner or his tenant possessed of capital is able to make the enterprise more fruitful than the peasant, and is also in the position to use better implements and tools, better breeding and working cattle, better manure, better corn for sowing, etc. The technical and commercial supremacy of agriculture on a large scale in Europe has during the last two decades been somewhat restricted owing to the agricultural competition from abroad, which proved a greater hardship to European agriculture on a large scale than to petty agricultural enterprise, firstly because it expressed itself principally in the raising of corn, a branch of agriculture in which the technical supremacy of the large enterprise over petty agriculture is most pronounced. In the large enterprise corn growing prevails, and this suffers most through the competition of the bonanza farms of America. Secondly, the large enterprise suffers more through foreign competition because it produces more with a view to the market, whilst the petty enterprise consumes a great portion of its own product, and is thus less dependent upon the market than the large enterprise.

But these favourable conditions for petty enterprise can be only temporary. Foreign competition does not remain restricted to corn growing; it extends also to the development of cattle raising, and production for self consumption with the peasant declines and becomes absorbed by the production of commodities, the production for sale.

It is principally the development of the railway and taxation system, which favours the extension of the production of commodities in agriculture. Through the railways the peasant obtains communication with the markets of the world. The taxes force him to go to the market, as he is unable to pay them without selling a certain quantity of his products. The higher the taxes, the more the peasant depends upon the market, the more his production becomes production of commodities, and the more he is affected by the competition of the large enterprise. To no class of our population is the increase of the taxes so disastrous as to the petty peasant.

Militarism constitutes to-day by far the most important cause for the increase of the taxes. Yet the same people, the large landowners, who pose as the best friends of the peasant, are the most active supporters of militarism. To the large landowners militarism offers only advantages. It necessitates enormous deliveries of victuals for men and horses, gigantic deliveries which can be best effected by the large enterprises, and to the sons of the large landowners militarism offers numerous highly paid positions as officers. Militarism deprives the peasant of his best worker, his son, and in his stead it burdens him with heavy taxes and drives him on the market, where he is oppressed by the competition of the large enterprises at home and by the bonanza farming of foreign countries.

The ruling classes see in the peasantry and the military the only safe pillars of the present social system. They fail to see that one of these pillars rests upon the other and crushes it by its increasing weight.

To be continued.

CRANKS.

There are people about who actually take pride in being called cranks. Crankiness (or is it crankery?) bids fair to become an established cult: it already has one periodical, *The Crank*, as an official organ, and there are hundreds of newspapers and magazines, daily, weekly, and monthly, that preach it under one or other of its hundred forms.

On the cover of "An Unconventional Magazine" a crank is defined as "a little thing which makes revolutions," but the dictionary gives us a much less flattering account: "a crook or bend; a conceit in speech; a whim." Into the composition of the modern crank all these constituents would seem to enter.

The crank is a man (or woman) who sees a part as the whole, a trivium as all important; his mind is so filled with his particular whim or fad that nothing else has place there. He looks at it so closely that he cannot see beyond it, like a man who holds a small object so near his eye that it obscures his view of everything else. To set forth all the classes and subdivisions of cranks is impossible in a short paper, for they are "as the sands of the sea shore for multitude," but we all know and have suffered from, among others, the health crank, the food crank, the religious crank, the land reform crank, the municipal crank, the education crank, the social reform crank, the temperance crank, the political crank.

All these people have recognised that there is something wrong with existing conditions, but instead of analysing these conditions as a whole in order to seek a remedy, they have all and each seized on some particular detail and made reform thereof a hobby horse to be ridden to death. And so there are hundreds of little sects of cranks, each trying to remedy some little social evil. Enormous quantities of ink and paper are wasted every year in voicing their views; each little group completely ignores all the others, and each has its own little patent panacea for the evils of Society.

"Reform" is the watchword of them all, and they have it in common that they all devote their attention to eliminating some effect of economic conditions while leaving those conditions themselves unchanged.

The Socialist, on the other hand, has regard to the whole rather than to any particular detail. He analyses all social conditions and traces them back to their economic root; he recognises that to alter effects is impossible without eliminating causes. In a word his method is the direct opposite to that of the crank!

The Socialist proves that all the evils from which Society suffers have their origin in the class ownership of the means (land, machinery, mines, etc.) by which the necessities of life are produced, and the consequent wage-slavery of the great mass of the people; he shows that from this one great economic wrong at the basis of Society arise all the other wrongs, social, political, and moral, and that therefore to right these, it is necessary first of all to change the economic basis of Society by bringing the means of production and distribution under the ownership and control of the whole community. To the Socialist it is just as sensible to try to rid a garden of nettles by picking off their leaves as to attempt to reform the social edifice while the rotten foundations remain untouched.

The Socialist therefore is not a crank.

But there are many cranks who call themselves Socialists. Sometimes these add a distinguishing epithet as "Christian" Socialists. When they do not do so, however, they can only be judged by their words and works. The crank Socialist is always going to do great things for Socialism after his own pet fad is achieved as a first step. To give a full list of these "first steps" would be impossible in the space at my disposal, but among the most familiar are:—Female Suffrage, Adult Suffrage, Payment of Members, Reversal of the Taff Vale Decision, Solution of the Unemployed Problem, Free Maintenance of School Children, Old Age Pensions, etc., etc. "Reform" is the magic word of the crank Socialist by which all these things are to be conjured up out of nowhere, while wage-slavery is still to remain.

though shorn of all its ill effects by successive acts of Parliament, and capitalism, though still existing, is to become a kind of metaphysical entity, an evil thing with no evil properties! This is the dream of the crank Socialist, but it is not Socialism.

Unfortunately, crankery is not only humorous, but harmful. Thousands of the working class who should be organising for Socialism have been drawn off to follow the will-o'-the-wisp of reform in search of the paradise of cranks.

If this were not so, and if crankery were confined to the bourgeoisie, we could afford to laugh at it; but as things are we must fight it and destroy it as perhaps the most dangerous obstacle in the path of Socialism.

R.A.V.M.

SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

At the Communist Club, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, the S.P.G.B. held its 2nd Annual Conference on Good Friday and Saturday.

It was unanimously agreed early in the proceedings to admit the press and the public.

Twenty-seven delegates attended, representing 13 branches. R. Elrick (Islington), was appointed chairman on Friday, and L. Boyne (Tottenham) on Saturday.

The report of the Executive Committee (which showed a gratifying increase of membership, an improved financial position, many enquiries from the provinces and prospects of the formation of several provincial branches, an extended circulation of *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD* and the holding of 600 propaganda meetings) was approved and adopted *non. con.* Arising from its discussion the E.C. were instructed to organise a cycling corps to further extend the area of Party activity.

Some considerable discussion arose over the election of officers. Eventually it was decided that as the only nomination for Secretary, and some of those for the Executive and Auditors, had arrived at Head Office late they were therefore invalid.

The following officers were then declared duly elected:—

Treasurer—A. J. M. Gray.
Executive—A. Anderson, A. Barker, J. Crump, H. Davies, T. Dix, P. Dumenil, J. Fitzgerald, W. Gifford, W. T. Hopley, A. Jones, T. A. Jackson, H. Neumann.

Auditor—J. H. Kennett.
T. A. Jackson was elected General Secretary *pro. tem.*

The voting on Amendments to Rules resulted in the alteration of seven Rules. The amendments will be included in further issues of the Party Manifesto and will be forwarded to Branches as soon as printed.

A keen and interesting discussion centred upon a resolution moved by J. J. Humphrey (Fullham) and seconded by W. T. Hopley (Paddington) respecting Trade Unionism, during which both supporters and opponents realized that very wide issues needing careful consideration were raised. The resolution was defeated by a card vote and it was unanimously agreed on the motion of H. C. Phillips (Romford) and F. Blewett (Battersea), "That the E.C. be instructed to call a Special Party Meeting to discuss our position re Trade Unionism, and that a poll of the Party be taken on all resolutions arising therefrom."

It was agreed on the motion of the Paddington Branch that an organiser be appointed.

The audited Treasurer's statement was, after discussion, unanimously adopted.

After the adjournment on Friday, a Social and Dance was held, lasting until midnight, at which many comrades and several friends of the Communist Club assisted the Amhurst Quadrille Band to entertain a crowded and well satisfied company.

The 2nd Annual Conference showed to all whom it may concern that the Socialist Party of Great Britain is moving steadily forward to the attainment of its ideal.

THE WORLD FOR THE WORKERS.

Copies of the Photograph of the Conference may be obtained at Head Office, price 2/- each, postage 3d.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed, —The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.

Twelve Months 1s. 6d.
Six Months 9d.

AMERICA.

Twelve Months 50 cents.
Six Months 25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.

SATURDAY, MAY 5, 1906.



MAY 1st, 1906.

On this day, the world over, the advance guard of the army of the revolution which is to break the power of the private possessors of the means of life to dominate and keep in subjection the workers who alone manipulate those means in the process of production, will meet in demonstration of their solidarity of purpose. On this day, in every country where capitalism has entered in to wring from the sweat and the sorrow of Labour, those profits which provide for capital's ministers luxurious comfort and all the pleasures that wealth can command, in earth and sky and sea, the harbingers of the co-operative Commonwealth destined to arise upon the debris of the present capitalist system which must give it birth, will gather rejoicing in the knowledge that everywhere their comrades have special thought for the international character of their mighty movement; that everywhere their comrades have turned aside from the work immediately before them to survey the vast field over which the operations of their many organisations extend, and to observe with glad satisfaction the measure of success which has attended the efforts of each section of their party. North, South, East and West, separated by vast seas and great mountains, yet animated by the same desire, inspired by the same ideal, fired by the same enthusiasm, the working-class armies press forward, steadily recruiting their strength as they go. Rank upon rank in ever increasing numbers they march, confident in the final issue of the struggle in which they are engaged.

It is well that we should take a short breathing space occasionally and renew our strength for our fight at home in the observation of the success of our comrades over-seas. To-day, whatever suggestion of insularity there may be in our work as a national section of an international movement, is dispelled as we stretch out the hand of fellowship to the organised, class-conscious workers of other countries, and echo back the shout of fraternal greeting with which they salute us.

ET TU BRUTE.

After Bebel—Lafargue. Writing to *Justice*, our comrade says: "The Socialists of the two worlds unite fraternally in heart and voice with English Socialists in celebrating the electoral victory of the working class of Great Britain. Its victory is the victory of International Socialism. . . . The Trade Unionists . . . understand at last that in order to ameliorate their lot and to benefit by the wealth which they alone produce, the workers must form themselves into a class party for the purpose of expropriating the capitalist class from political and economic power."

Which is precisely what they do not understand. As Lafargue himself unwillingly admits, "the movement is confused, uncertain, unconscious." And it is unconscious and confused because the Trade Unionists do not understand the necessity for the formation of "a class party for the purpose of expropriating the capitalist class." How, therefore, Lafargue can hail the electoral victories of a confused, uncertain and unconscious movement as victories for International Socialism we fail to understand, while to talk of "the cool energy of the British working class that no effort will weary and no defeat discourage," is to attribute to us virtues which are certainly not the conspicuous or peculiarly characteristic possessions of the British working class. We fear that Comrade Lafargue has allowed his kindly May-day desire to say something nice and appreciative to lead him to express himself in terms provocative of the idea that his acquaintance with English conditions is unhappily superficial—an idea which, knowing Lafargue's high standing in the international movement and being acquainted with his exceedingly valuable contributions to Socialist thought, we are loth to entertain. We cannot agree that the election of the nominees of the Labour Representation Committee were working class victories. We have shewn them to have been achieved partly in alliance with capitalist Liberalism, and wholly by a class-unconscious vote. Does our comrade believe that because Trade Unions stimulated into political activity by certain legal decisions having the effect of endangering the financial reserves of their organisations, have entered into a loose association for the purpose of recovering a position they had thought themselves secure in, that, therefore, they have established themselves upon a definite class basis in opposition to the political expressions of capitalist interests? Why, every indication gives a flat denial to the supposition. Their leaders dare not formulate a programme that would emphasize the antagonism of interest and dare not even if they desired it, proceed in such fashion as would bring them into sharp conflict with the capitalist parties, because the membership of their organization have not yet withdrawn their allegiance from those capitalist parties. These leaders, some of whom at times profess Socialism, frankly drop their Socialism to secure the support of the Labour Representation Committee on the ground that to urge Socialism would alienate the Trade Unionists who are not Conservative! And, so they proceed with halting steps and no little trepidation along the tortuous and unprofitable path of reform legislation, which, as our Comrade Lafargue will not be inclined to dispute, is not calculated to effect that sound class organisation of the workers which it is the sole purpose of the Socialist propagandist to facilitate, but is, on the contrary, more likely to result in confusion and apathy, because the attention of the working class is diverted to the consideration of immaterial issues. We need only add here a quotation from a speech by one who is regarded as among

the most advanced thinkers, directing this new pseudo-labour organisation, which Lafargue regards so favourably. He may see in it an indication that the Trade Unionists of Great Britain are still far from recognising, "that their ideal of a fair day's wage for a fair day's work recedes in proportion to the development of capitalist production." Thus: "For years the Association he represented had been trying to organize the town of High Wycombe. They were not doing that with any animosity towards the employers or the capitalists. Whatever might be their opinion as between capital and labour, as practical men of the world they knew that under present circumstances capital and labour had to co-operate in production. . . . They as Trade Unionists said that if the principle of combination was good for the workmen it was good also for the employers. As workmen they wanted to see as strong a combination amongst the employers as it was possible to get. And why? Because if the employer wanted to conserve the interests of his capital, the only possible way to do it was to prevent unfair cut-throat competition. The only way he could do that was to combine with his fellow capitalists, so that they might come to an understanding with the organisation representing labour, that there should be a bed-rock set of conditions that should determine the prices at which they should put their goods on the market. . . . He believed that if there were 75 per cent. of the workmen in the Trade Union at High Wycombe and if there was a strong federation among the employers, they would double their wage in five years."—J. O'Grady, M.P., made organizer of the National Amalgamated Furnishing Trades Association, reported in the *Society Circular* for April, 1905.

And this is one of the "Socialist" leaders of the new "Labour" Party, one of the victors in the electoral contest which achieved "a victory for International Socialism." He is a fair type of the new movement's fore-front men, and his views a fair sample of the views of the "extremists" of the Party. How long then, Comrade Lafargue, will it take, think you, to build up a working class party on these lines? And where in this speech is the idea of mutuality of interest between capital and labour, which is the hallmark of class-unconsciousness and continued working-class enslavement, combatted as one would expect it combatted by an organizer of victory for International Socialism? It is not combatted at all of course either by O'Grady or any other leader of the new Party. It is deliberately fostered, and while that continues to be the attitude of the leaders of the Party acquiesced in by the rank and file, it is idle and mischievous to endeavour, as both Bebel and Lafargue have done, to invest the movement with an importance that may only be correctly applied to an enlightened proletarian organization on well defined class lines.

THAT BLESSED WORD—UNITY!

With Easter comes the Annual Conferences of those bodies which, with fine contempt for the meaning of words, call themselves Socialist, and with the conferences come also the customary demands, appeals, and entreaties for unity. And, indeed, there is no real reason why these bodies should not unite, seeing that in practice they do not differ. It is true the S.D.F. say they could not join the L.R.C. if it were ever so, because the L.R.C. is a non-Socialist body and an alliance might involve them in non-Socialist action. But as the S.D.F. is continually taking, not only non-Socialist, but anti-Socialist, action, that does not seem an insuperable objection. True again the I.L.P. say that they cannot join with the S.D.F. because the S.D.F. will not join the L.R.C. a sort of argumentative circle which might be vicious were any vital principle involved. True again neither S.D.F. nor I.L.P. will join with the Fabian Society because George Bernard Shaw, who is the Fabian Society, often makes it clear that "he dunno where he is," nor would they, presumably, join that other "Socialist" organisation called the Clarion (Cycling Club, whose many thousands of members may also be members of Liberal or Tory

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

INDIVIDUAL VERSUS COLLECTIVE WELL-BEING.

SOME time has elapsed since last I made my bow before the audience—or should I say voyance—of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. Before the pressure of more urgent matters it has been necessary for me to leave many doubts and difficulties unsolved. One difficulty indeed I must frankly confess my powerlessness to solve. It came in simple guise. "What is the difference between the Liberal and the Tory Party?" Thus ran the question! Of course, I at once sat down to answer it. But, alas, for human vanity!

For weeks the question haunted me. Meals, the scanty meals of a worker—went neglected; my face got haggard and wan; I shrunk visibly—no, no, Mr. Editor, this is not an adyt, and yet no solution would come. The difference was one which I could not discover. A happy thought struck me. Yes, I should read their literature. I should explore the mysterious depths of comparative politics.

I have read their literature. For weeks past I have been wading through the mire of their party press. Pamphlets, election addresses, speeches of Parliamentary candidates have been perused and still the difference between these two parties is to seek. The same trickery of working-class welfare, joined with the same desire to wring as much profit as possible from the labour of that working class. But enough of the unsavoury subject. Let us proceed.

A General Election has come and gone. The result has been a remarkable victory for the capitalist class. They have rallied round them with the help of the Labour Party (sic) an unexampled enthusiasm. Peer and peasant, and the wives of peer and peasant have made a triumphant rally under the capitalist banner, and henceforth all will be well.

Unprecedented is the only word which can describe that election. Mrs. Smith, the dockers' wife, pawing her jewellery to help the candidature of the big commercial magnate—she tells me she got ninepence for her bangle, and sixpence for a nickel chain which was a family heirloom) was a sight for gods and men.

The pity of it! The working class, with their minimum of education, misled as to their true interest by the press and by pretended working-class leaders, have again been betrayed, for the present Government have already shown clearly that so far as the workers are concerned, no material improvement will result. Pious resolutions are passed in favour of reforms, but "the public exchequer is empty" and nothing can be done.

I cannot say that I am sorry for this failure of reform. The capitalist class interests are not seriously threatened. Why then should the capitalist class throw sops to the worker. Only when the worker says plainly that reforms will not do, will reforms be seriously offered to him. Then the legislators of the present ruling class will try to wane the worker from a determination to stop at nothing short of revolutionising the entire basis of Society.

The time for this has not yet come. The worker does not realise that he is a slave. He is not a free man. Any man who is compelled to obey another who holds possession of his means of livelihood is to all intents and purposes a slave to that other. This is the position of the working man. There is no freedom for him during the period of the day for which he has sold himself and beyond that period the needs of the body for rest restrict the individual freedom.

To us the whole business seems so simple.

The means of sustaining man in life are material. The food the worker desires to eat belongs to the owner of the soil; the clothing he desires to wear belongs to the owner of the factory; the house he wants to live in belongs to a landlord. The worker has been trained to a standard of comfort which demands these things. Without them he could not live. He would cease to exist.

The owners of these various goods have no use for them. They wish to get rid of them, but not for nothing. They want to sell the goods they possess to those who can use them. The bulk of those who can use them cannot buy them until they possess something to buy them with. The only goods the working class possess with which they can buy things is their power of working. They are, however, in the unfortunate position of having only particular methods of exercising their power of working, and these methods are not wanted by the owners of the goods.

The worker must find some one who wishes to buy his particular kind of labour power, and sell it to him for the universal equivalent of unspecialised labour power—money. But his desire for food, clothing, and shelter are always with him and the number of men possessing his kind of labour power is always in excess of the demand. Therefore, the tendency is, through the operation of the laws governing competition, for the amount obtainable for labour power to sink to a minimum. That minimum—the minimum to which the average wage of the worker ever tends to fall, is that amount which will just provide the barest subsistence for the working man and his family.

The man is considered as a machine. So much money is required to keep this mechanism going, but, like every machine, man gets worn out and has to be replaced. The method of replacement for man is exactly the same as for any other piece of machinery. A certain amount is set aside for the purpose of replacement. For the ordinary machinery it appears, in the accounts as "wear and tear," but for the human machinery it is manifested in a slightly higher wage than would be necessary if the working class could live at their normal working strength for ever.

The working man is but a slavish mechanism—a mechanical slave. He is docile and he is ignorant. He has, however, a latent power which will one day become active and he will recognise that it is possible to organise the industries of a country in the interests of the people of the country. He will see that it is necessary for man to work because it is necessary for man to eat. But he will also see that because it is necessary for every man to eat, it is no less necessary for every man to work. He will see also that the end of all work is the satisfaction of men's material requirements, and he will work directly towards that end.

To-day, however, all this is far from clear. The end which is secured is less the satisfaction of man's needs than the establishment of a class apart which is enabled to monopolise the wealth and power of the country and only parts with a portion of its monopoly in order to increase and maintain them.

This leads me to the difficulty which I set out to deal with. I was discussing recently the important question of population, when the remark was made that it was conceivable that a small family was good for the community as a whole. But no, it was objected. A thing can not be good for an individual without being good for the community. A community is the sum of all its individuals.

I am not here concerned with "limitation of family" ideas. What I wish to combat is the pernicious doctrine that in our modern society whatever is good for the individual is good for the community. The doctrine is untrue and it is harmful. The very essence of the structure

of capitalist society is that the good of one individual, the comfortable living of one person prevents or militates against the happiness and welfare of others.

Riches have their necessary counterpart in poverty. Men get rich because men are kept poor. It is the very first principle of modern society. This society is indeed divided along economic lines and into economic classes. The working class which produces the whole of the wealth over against the capitalist class which owns the whole of the wealth. The class which gets its income from profit, rent, and interest—that is, from the unpaid labour of the working class, is called the capitalist class. The class over against the capitalist class which labours under the most unhealthy conditions and which creates all profit, rent, and interest is the working class.

The individual good of the capitalist involves the living in slums, the wearing of shoddy clothing, the eating of adulterated food for the worker. The good of the worker when he gets a higher average wage modifies the good of the capitalist.

So, too, with the sectional differences within the two classes which divide the community. The individual worker who finds an employer and the consequent means of living keeps some other worker out of a job. The individual capitalist who monopolises some new labour saving machinery and thereby "scoops" the market, proves anything but a good to his competitor of the same class.

In only one society which the human mind has been able to conceive could the good of the individual prove the good of the community. In that society the selfishness and the altruism of the individual would be one and the same. The desires, the actions, and the happiness of all men would be harmonised, for a society would have been evolved in which an identification of the interests of all men would have arisen. Such a state of Society is one in which the economic foundation would be that of common property, and the political life would consist in the administration of the Commonwealth. Such a society would be a Socialist society and the coming of such a society, which is as certain as the coming of tomorrow's sun or of the next issue of *The Socialist Standard*, would be the harbinger of joy to all living men and may one of those who lives to see that day be—

Economics.

UNITED IRISH LEAGUE.

WANT AN S.P.G.B. MAN TO DEBATE SOCIALISM, BUT ARE NOT ANXIOUS FOR THE ENCOUNTER AFTER ALL.

The following correspondence has passed between the "Irish Parliament" Branch of the United Irish League and The Socialist Party of Great Britain:

United Irish League,
"Irish Parliament" Branch,
205, High Holborn, W.C.
21/1/06.

Dear Mr. ————
I am told your friend Mr. C. Lehane is a great debater on Socialism. Could you secure him for the "I.P." for either the last Friday in February or the first Friday in March to open a debate? A speedy reply will greatly oblige.

Yours fraternally,
J. BUNTING.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
1a, Caledonian Road, N.
17th Feb., 1906.

Mr. J. Bunting,
Sec. United Irish League
"Irish Parliament" Branch.

Dear Sir,
With reference to your communication dated

21st ult., which has been forwarded to the undersigned at this office, I am directed by the Executive Committee to invite your organization to nominate a representative to meet me in debate. The proposition to be discussed could be:

"That the economic and political freedom of the people can be secured only by the establishment of Socialism, and that any political party, e.g., the United Irish League, not based upon this principle is unworthy of the confidence of the people."

I will take the affirmative, your champion to take the negative.

Please let me know when you have selected your representative so that the necessary arrangements may be made.

Yours faithfully,
C. LEHANE,
General Secretary.

United Irish League,
"Irish Parliament" Branch,
1a, Caledonian Road,
13/06.

Mr. C. Lehane,
1a, Caledonian Road,
Dear Sir,

With reference to yours of the 17th ult., I regret that we are unable to accept your kind offer of debate. Our programme of fixtures is now full up for the next 6 weeks, and we have had already two debates on Socialism within the past month and have another fixed for next week. On some future occasion the "Irish Parliament" will be glad to meet you. Thanking you for your kind offer.

I am,
Yours faithfully,
J. BUNTING,
Hon. Sec.

We note that "on some future occasion" the "Irish Parliament" will be glad to meet our Comrade. Now or in the future the S.P.G.B. is prepared to meet the representatives of any other Parties claiming the confidence of the people, but in the present instance, seeing that it was the "I.P." which first broached the proposed debate, it would have been thought they would have been prepared for an immediate discussion of the question. Perhaps it is that the "I.P." not feeling sure of its ground has put a champion in training, but seeing that the Chairman of the "I.P." Branch of the U.I.L. is John O'Connor, Esq., B.L., M.P., he at any rate ought to be in a position to defend his organization without deferring the debate to some indefinite "future occasion." Be that as it may, the S.P.G.B. is at the service of the "Irish Parliament" whenever the latter deems fit to nominate a representative.

The "Irish Parliament" judging by the contents of the last letter seems to be devoting a good deal of time to discussing Socialism, but we venture to assert that the "Socialism" hitherto propounded to its members by those who have undertaken to explain it to them is of that nebulous character which has caused so much confusion in the minds of the people here and elsewhere. In Great Britain individuals are frequently to be met with who claim to be Socialists and at the same time Liberals, Socialists and at the same time Conservatives, Socialists and at the same time United Irish Leaguers. It is the mission of the S.P.G.B. to see to it that these anomalies are removed and by its educational propaganda to clarify the issue so that Socialists will stand out as a political party distinct from and antagonistic to every other party. If all those who call themselves Socialists were organised in a Socialist Party, Socialism would be a power in the land to-day.

IMPORTANT!

PLEASE NOTE—

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

FARCE OR TRAGEDY?

In 1901 at the French Trade Union Congress, the delegates, by an overwhelming majority, decided to inaugurate a general 8 hours strike on the First of May, 1906. At the time of writing this the period is near at hand when the unions will be expected to put to the test this anarchistic idea of which they are enamoured. The wretched betrayal of the workers by Millerand and the compromising policy that was pursued by the *bloc* in the Chamber had its effect by throwing the militant proletariat into a fierce anti-parliamentary campaign. One can only admire the spirit of revolt which animates these wage workers who are tired of the dilettante performances of their "Socialist" reformers; still, in spite of, or perhaps because of, that admiration, we must not overlook the means by which they are going to try and get the 8 hours' day.

The General Strike as such, without being backed up by a political force (and an armed force at that), has never been successful. And although some may point to Russia as a refutation of this position, the fact is that even there it has simply been used in conjunction with an armed political movement. In Italy recently the general strike did not last long, and notwithstanding that on the railways the "passive resistance" of the employees, severely hindered the work of the railroads, it did not prevent them being used. After all, our comrades of the working class of France at this juncture only contemplate a general strike for an 8 hours day, and afterwards, presumably, whether won or not, they go back to work for their masters just as before. An 8 hours day, if attained, does not necessarily mean any permanent reduction of the unemployed. Machinery is used when it is cheaper than human labour, and a restriction of the hours of labour will only mean an impetus to the introduction of machinery, and a greater intensity of labour for those at work, with a quicker wearing out of the wage slaves.

An 8 hours day is not high enough goal for the workers to try to gain, by pitting their empty stomachs and pockets against the full ones of their masters. To enter into a prolonged struggle in this manner, and for such an object, is somewhat foolish. They are going to strike by walking away from the workshops and factories and leaving them as the full and undisputed property of their masters, to be kept by them till the workers return to be still further exploited.

The French workers have not a sufficiently extensive economic and political organisation at present for a general strike to be a success. They will have to organise as a class on the political as well as on the economic field. There must be no division, no walling-off of skilled and unskilled, employed and unemployed, no splitting up of the workers in one industry into a number of antagonistic autonomous units, but their organisation as a whole in one body. When the workers are organised as a class, understanding what the aim of a militant body of workers should be (viz., the overthrow of the capitalist system of the private ownership in the means and instruments of producing and distributing the necessities of life), they will not attempt a general strike for an eight hour day, but working intelligently with, and as part of, a revolutionary class party, they will use their organisation, not to the exclusion of their members from the workshops and factories, but to the end that the workers may run them in their co-operative capacity as the property of the working class. It will not be a general strike but a general lock-out of the master class.

The economic arm alone is not sufficient, it needs the political arm to break down the ramparts capitalism has erected in its defence. The political is not sufficient unless it has the economic to lay the foundation of the co-operative commonwealth. As the French workers are not organised in this wise, as the strike contemplated is not with the active co-operation of a revolutionary political force, and as the workers have evidently not yet grasped their mission, things point to it being a farce. A farce it will be unless the armed forces of the government are brought down on the strikers and convert a farce into a tragedy. E.J.B.A.

A LOOK ROUND.

Last month the "Progressive" London County Council took over the tramways of the North Metropolitan Company and immediately signalled the march of "progress" by withdrawing a privilege that passengers had hitherto enjoyed.

Under the Company management two-journey tickets were issued at the rate of three-fourths of two "all-the-way" fares. The return portion of the ticket was available by any route at any time; but, so soon as ownership and control by the public capitalists was substituted for that of the private ones, notices were exhibited in each car stating that these would be available on the day of issue only.

Such is the "progressive" policy of Messrs. Benn, Crooks, Burns, Isaac Mitchell & Co.

Eastwood & Co. have introduced a new process of making bricks at their works at Conyer, near Sittingbourne, by which bricks of good quality are now turned out by machinery in seven days, against three months under the old hand-made process.

There are "reformers" who, amongst other wild ideas, propose to solve the "problem" of the unemployed by a revival and extension of the apprenticeship system. By it, for example, they would increase the number of expert brick-makers, and then, even before then—along comes a machine which does all their work in one-thirteenth of the time!

Some people would argue that it would be better to put aside the machine and make the bricks by hand; but these are usually people who have never made nor attempted to make any bricks. They are not Socialists. Socialists are working for the elimination of waste, for the greatest economy in the production and distribution of wealth. The difference between Socialism and Capitalism as regards machinery is that under Socialism machinery will be a real labour saver, reducing the hours of necessary work of all the wealth producers in the community, whilst under Capitalism machinery simply reduces the wages bill of the capitalist and intensifies the unemployed question.

It is not, of course, wise to dogmatise as to the extent of the reduction of hours of labour that will be effected by the industrial organisation that will obtain under Socialism, but it is easy to see that when all useless occupations, such as those which are the necessary concomitants of the competitive system, are eliminated, and those engaged therein are performing their share of the useful labour; when those who are now chronically unemployed or are in the ranks of the predatory professionals (or should it be the professional predators?) are also helping, what an enormous reduction of each worker's hours will be possible.

It is sometimes suggested that people under Socialism, having reduced the necessary labour to a minimum, will not know what to do with themselves in the leisure hours. It doesn't strike me that way. In the summer time, at any rate, I can always enjoy a "laze," stretched with my "back-to-the-land" by the side of a stream or the sea, and if I were living under a Socialist State, and had done my fair share of the necessary work, I don't think time would hang very heavily on my hands. I have yet to learn that I am constituted much differently to other folk.

A book which is often mentioned when discussions arise concerning the hours of labour under Socialism is "Our National Resources and how they are wasted." It was written by William Hoyle and published in 1871. The writer said (page 36), "Assuming every person did their share, a total of 14 hours' daily labour would suffice to supply us in abundance with all the comforts of life." He added, "The progress of invention and the increasing application

of machinery, are daily reducing even this amount of labour, so that the part which has now mainly to be played by man is simply to superintend the machinery which does the work." That was nearly 40 years ago.

Speaking of Wm. Hoyle reminds me of the shock which the rabid totalitarians have recently received. They glibly assert that "drink is the chief cause of crime," and that "drink fills our prisons," etc. Dr. Emile Reich has proved, by quotations from the United States Census Report on Crime, Pauperism, and Benevolence, that total abstainers committed more crimes than drunkards, and now we have a Special Correspondent of *The Tribune* declaring that, as a result of his investigations at Dartmoor, "the bulk of these specialists in crime, who represent the Genius of Evil, are confirmed totalitarians."

Farther than this, the *Daily News*, the anti-alcohol, pro-cock organ, last week reviewed the Criminal Statistics for England and Wales in 1904 and said, "Summarising the results, drunkenness is regarded as stationary, but minor offences of dishonesty and serious frauds and breaches of trust have increased, while offences of the vagrancy class are declared to be growing rapidly." And if "drink fills our lunatic asylums" how is it that the consumption has seriously declined in recent years, but the number of lunatics has considerably increased?

"The deepest root of the evils and iniquities which fill the industrial world is . . . the subjection of labour to capital and the enormous share which the possessors of the instruments of industry are able to take from the produce." J. S. MULL.

Those who think that imprisonment for debt is one of the barbarisms of the past may be interested in the fact that 19,217 debtors went to prison in 1904, the figures for the four previous years being 17,598, 15,710, 13,635, and 12,375 respectively.

The recent earthquake and resulting fires in San Francisco have considerably affected the shares of many British and German Fire Insurance Companies. In these countries, as well as in America and others, the workers are exhorted to "support home industries," "keep the money in the country," etc. But these considerations do not weigh with the employing class. They know no lines of demarcation, whether geographical, national, or racial. And American capitalists are quite as willing to pay premiums to British Insurance Companies when it suits their purpose as British ones are to invest in industrial concerns abroad to compete against British productions.

But the fact that a seismic upheaval, as the "penny-a-liners" have it, occurring miles away, has caused the price of certain British shares to considerably decline on the London Stock Exchange, has a greater interest for the working class than at first sight appears. It shows the internationalism of capitalism.

This has of course been shown before. When Mr. Joseph Leiter was operating in Chicago with the object of cornering the world's wheat supply, the price of wheat, flour, and bread rose, not only in America, but all over the civilized world, and in Southern Europe starving workers who were parading the streets unable to obtain bread, because of the prohibitive prices, were shot down by the national defenders of international capitalism. This was dealt with in detail in the article "Invasion or Starvation," which appeared in *The Socialist Standard* in July last.

Capitalism has long since ceased to be local and national. It is international. The workers are hoodwinked by the capitalist class and their henchmen into thinking that workmen of other districts, of other countries, of other races, are their enemies. But the capitalists draw no distinction. They set out to exploit the working

class irrespective of race, creed, or colour. They organise, but as a class against the working class. The working class have not yet learned the lesson placed before them by their masters.

It is to the capitalists' interests that the workers should be dissuaded, but that it organised they should be organised sectionally, even to the extent of workers in different departments of the same industry forming separate Unions and often blacklegging each other. This suits the so-called Labour Leader as well as the employing class. The more Unions the more jobs, the more joint conferences with the employers, and the more drawings of expenses by the "representatives of the men," etc. And when some Trade Unionist arises to urge that so many Unions are inadvisable and prejudicial to the workers' interest, that they involve more paid officials than are really necessary and are used by the capitalist class against each other, the "leaders" always find insurmountable difficulties against amalgamation, and if something must be done, they effect a Federation, and create some more well-paid jobs for their own kidney.

The "General Federation of Trade Unions" job will be fresh in the minds of most readers.

There is no hope for the workers until they become class-conscious, that is, until they recognise that their interests, like their masters', are not sectional, trade, or national, but *class*, and that they must organise, as a *class*, as the international proletariat, "to the end" in the words of our Declaration of Principles, "that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom."

Writing in the *Labour Leader* the Gates-head I.L.P. express the opinion "that the reason that Socialism is not making the progress we have a right to expect is largely to be found in the matter served up to their audiences by our I.L.P. lecturers."

Truth will sometimes out! If the I.L.P. lecturers were Socialists, intent upon imparting to the working class a clear understanding of the principles of Socialism, the matter served up would be different. But, as we have proved, to go no further back than the General Election, the I.L.P. leaders threw over their principles when they found that if they adhered to them they would fail to reach the above-all-things coveted seat in the House of Commons.

"Thank God," writes the editor of the *Labour Leader*, "we are not logicians." Thank God, say we, we are guiltless of laying that charge to their door.

In the course of the recent action for slander brought by Mr. J. Pitt Hardacre against Mr. Joseph Beaver Williams, a Labour member of the Manchester City Council, and prominent by his connection with the Musicians' Union, the defendant admitted that when addressing meetings at Openshaw, in Manchester, he had not confined himself strictly to the truth.

It will go hard with lying Labour "leaders" when the workers get hold of the truth!

J. KAY.

Manifesto of the S.P.G.B. (last free L. 1000)
28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

Under the heading "The Earth for all" *The Crank* proposes to publish a series of papers on political economy. The introductory article says "under conditions where there was no private property in land extremes of poverty and wealth could not exist." Couldn't they? If the writer proposes to show that extremes of poverty could not exist under a system of nationalized land only, we shall await further contributions with interest.

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

WEST HAM.

West Ham is neither dead nor asleep, although so far as branch reports in our Organ are concerned some comrades might be justified in having come to that rash conclusion. Neither he "with lips of livid blue" nor his fraternal relative "rosy as the morn," has been reigning here. The fact is we are poor, and have been experimenting on silence to see if it be golden. We have empirically demonstrated the hollowness of the platitude: all we can say in its favour is that silence seems to be cheaper than speech, seeing we are in debt for our branch advt. Like the bears, the dormice, and other sweet children of Nature, however, we must confess to a more somnolent attitude during the hibernating period than in the season of out-door propaganda. In Winter we can get no raw material on which to exercise our propagandist power; sensible men, the kind we want to convert, will not stand to be frozen, so all we can do is to drill, to sharpen our weapons, and otherwise get ready for the Summer campaign. We have done a bit of that, and are now in the streets carrying on the war. Several successful skirmishes have already taken place, and an assault in force was made on East Ham on Saturday 21, led by Comrade Anderson. Several supporters of the brewing section of the capitalist class turned up as usual and opposed in their usual undisciplined manner, but also some "bonnie fighters" appeared, and were bonnily fought. Anderson hits straight and hard. He is coming back: so are some of his opponents when they have recovered.

At our Forest Gate station we seem to have struck a better vein this year than last; and one of our apprentice-lecturers has drawn a strong opponent—a Mr. C. Quinn—who objects to our revolutionary attitude, claims to be a Socialist himself, believes and is prepared to demonstrate that Socialism is only to be established through a long series of reforms, only useful in their educational effect and as stepping-stones to Socialism. As this gentleman has signified his readiness to debate the whole question with a representative of our Party, the Branch is arranging a meeting.

G.C.H.C. (Branch Reporter.)

TOOTING.

Still young and still vigorous, going right out for Socialism as the only remedy for the condition of our class, carefully avoiding everything likely to mislead and confuse, what time we do all that we may to combat the influence of those who seem, deliberately and of malice aforethought, to adopt exactly opposite methods.

We have received an invitation from the local Trades Council to send delegates to a conference convened to draw up an ideal programme suitable to all sections of the Labour Party. We know those conferences and those ideal programmes and have respectfully declined to accept the invitation. Our members are quite satisfied with the Party programme as expressed in the Declaration of Principles, and from our intimate knowledge of the Trades Council gentlemen (whose ideal programme at the General Election consisted in an appeal to the workers to vote Liberal) the outcome of their earnest deliberations is not likely to embody an improvement upon our present position. For the same reason we are not drawn to assist "Clarion Van" propaganda. We prefer to remain Socialist propagandists all the time, thank you.

R.B.

WATFORD.

We promised ourselves that at the forthcoming Urban District Council Elections we would make ourselves heard and—it was so. We issued a manifesto, and pressed into it as simply and directly as possible a statement of the working-class position, and some of the reasons why we were obliged to deliberately range ourselves in opposition to every candidate standing for election, even those specially claiming to voice working-class interests. In the result the pseudo-labour gentlemen whose pretensions we particularly directed our argument against were all defeated by large majorities.

Printed by Jacob Bros., (L.U.), 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

As to how far our Manifesto helped to this end we do not pretend to say, but we know that the possibility of the issue of such a document was regarded with much misgiving by some of the "Labour" candidates' followers: who have not hesitated to lay the responsibility for their catastrophe at our door. We accept the responsibility. We would accept far greater responsibility if such were incurred by telling the truth that alone can make the workers free. We have no concern for "victories" gained by cloaking facts. Our business is to disseminate facts, all the facts and nothing but the facts. It was to facts that we confined ourselves in our manifesto. Therefore if the "Labour" candidates were defeated through our manifesto it was because the facts against them were too strong: because they were in conflict with the truth.

The incidents connected with the issue of our leaflet may be interesting. One is specially noteworthy. While our secretary was arranging with the printer, the editor of the little monthly sheet which the "Labour" party here issue, called. Subsequently the printer, who was also printer of the little journal mentioned, intimated that he had found he could not do our job. Why? Because he had received instructions to keep the "Labour" journal "up," and so could not use the type to print our manifesto! Here was a predicament! We had only a day or two to get it out. We tried half a dozen local shops. Only one could do it in the time, and the price asked was 100 per cent. higher than the first firm's! As a last resource we posted the MSS. to a London printer. It was turned out at top speed. We had no time to read a proof (which will account for one or two sentences reading awkwardly). We had the copies wet from the press and rushed them out the same night. It was a near thing.

We mention all this for two reasons. First to call attention to the act of the "Labour" journal's editor which temporarily stopped our manifesto against the "Labour" editor's party. Secondly, as an answer to those who, we hear, are alleging against us that we went to a "rat" shop for our printing. We don't know whether our printers were trade union or not, although an objection of that sort coming from persons who are probably clad in sweated garments and certainly use some articles produced by sweated labour, does not perturb us. We only point out that even were our alleged offence as heinous as some of the "Labour" Party, for lack of other ground for criticism, would have it believed, they themselves by the act of their representative are responsible.

Heartiest thanks to all comrades and friends who lent us such ready assistance. No room for more this report.

THE BRANCH.

The Gaelic American, (New York.) In offering a new Mauser rifle, with knife-bayonet and ammunition, to readers securing subscribers, says in explanation, "Ireland can only be made free by driving out the English. That can only be done by physical force. Physical force means war and the essential thing in modern war is good shooting. . . . Until Irishmen learn to shoot straight they might as well be 'whistling jigs to milestones' as talking of turning the English out of Ireland. Nothing but good shooting will drive them out. . . . The Irish Nationalist in America who means business will learn to shoot. . . ."

However much we may regret that such spirited determination is evoked for an object which, even if realised, could only mean a change of masters for the Irish working-class and not an appreciable change of condition, the unequivocal terms in which the reasons are expressed compel admiration.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE

28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

BEXLEY & DISTRICT.—R. A. V. Morris, Sec., Oxshott, Warren Rd., Bexley Heath Branch meets Wednesdays at Sec's House at 8. Public Meetings, Market Place, Bexley Heath, Sundays at 8.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmingtong Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmingtong Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—G. Wilson, Sec., 14, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets every Saturday at 8.30 at above address.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Secretary, 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Sundays at 3.30.

FULHAM.—E. Fairbrother, Secretary, 15, Musgrove Crescent, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—Communications to the Secretary, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Mondays at 9 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m. at the Branch Rooms, 29, The Parade, Tooting, which are open to members and friends every evening.

TOTTENHAM.—H. A. Young, Secretary, 46, Rosebery Gardens, Green Lanes, Harringay, N. Branch meets Sundays 7 p.m., at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Sq., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD (Vol. I. Bound) 3s. 6d.

MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO 2½d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES' BOY 1½d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 6½d.

ALL POST FREE.

VOL. I.

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Well bound in stiff boards.

Post Free 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be sent to Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.



THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 22. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, JUNE, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

CAPTAINS AND GUIDES.

THE National Union of Teachers has been in existence for 35 years. It has three representatives in Parliament, a membership rivalling in numbers the great Trade Unions, each member a "captain and guide of the democracy." An Archbishop sends greeting to its latest Conference, Vicar and Major, Ex-Cabinet Minister and M.P., all unite to "welcome" and patronise the delegates assembled at said Conference. All are greeted with rapturous "applause," and all is as well as well can be in this best of all possible educational worlds.

And yet—and yet—the career of a "captain," the lot of a "guide," is still like unto the policeman's life "when constabulary duty's to be done." List to the plaint of the President, "A career inadequately remunerated, passed under harassing conditions, practically in many cases, the servants of officials who rule with an iron hand, depending for their livelihood on voice and brain, and, if these fail, cast aside without remorse."

Every "elementary" teacher will agree with this picture. Who can say who will be the next to swell the scrap-heap which the present state of Society is ever tending to increase? In case of breakdown, his service to the State entitles him to a pauper's dole, his old age is rewarded with little better. He is a little higher than the artisan, and a little lower than the bank clerk. In any case, he is absolutely dependent upon wages for his subsistence. He is, in short, a proletarian. Does he ever seriously consider that, for class purposes, he is ever busily employed in manufacturing better material for the merchant and sweeter, sturdier stuff, mayhap for "cannon fodder," obedient tools to shoot their own kith and kin if necessary. Does his ever-increasing dread of inspector and "organiser," his anything but dignified scramble for "promotion" ever give him time to reflect that a proportion of his scholars will inevitably join the ranks of the unemployed, that a Social System which he (for the most part) accepts as "inevitable," but which is merely rendered possible by his mental inertia, and the mental inertia of his fellow-workers in all walks of life, will condemn some of the scholars to join the army of shame in our great city?

I rejoice that there are faint gleams in our ranks (I speak as a teacher) of the dawn of class consciousness. The utterance of the President at Conference was an indication in this direction, as was that of the President of the London Teachers' Association last October. "Did the man in the street but realise that the struggle between the Old and the New in education was in progress, and that he was interested in the result, that *Democracy was contending against Privilege*, he would come in and help."

But there is clearly a very faint perception among teachers of real issues that will have to be met, perhaps not so many decades hence. I put it to the less prejudiced of the profession would any historian imagine from the proceedings of the Conference that 13,000,000 were on the borderland of, or beneath, the poverty line? Men who have hardly learnt to think outside their Catechism, who are apparently proud of

their subordination to a church whose chief "educational" aim has been to keep the teacher in his proper station, and to see that he inculcates in his pupils due respect for his "pastors and masters," unite with more or less sincere believers in "Simple Bible Teaching," to cheer such "tosh" as "if the Bible is excluded from the schools, they shut out in the slums and towns of the great cities tens of thousands of little scraps of humanity from the sweetening and bee-utifying influences of Christian truth." Really, they must have been exceptionally conscientious down Bristol way in times past. One cannot help calling to mind how, in this unregenerate Metropolis, whole "Scripture" lessons were quietly, but firmly, appropriated for instruction in other than "Christian truth" when the "Annual Parade Day" neared. And—"Christian Truth!" "What is Truth?" said jesting Pilate. Should he be polite enough to "wait for an answer" to-day, one might reply, "Dunno. I'll ask you one, what is *Christian* Truth?"

Comrades—Socialism is "in the air." In any case it behoves you as teachers and students to acquaint yourselves with a force that has already commanded the attention of serious men and women of all classes. We are not "all Socialists now." That is one of the lies resorted to by a class that well understands the real import of the radical change implied by real Socialism. The Socialist Party of Great Britain has been formed to do educational spade work in the matter of Socialism. It is a frankly intransigent body, which believes firmly in Socialism as the *only* possible way to economic salvation and clean living. Rejecting all compromise, viewing all "palliative" mongering with distrust and suspicion, it is determined to make for the goal of Social Salvation by ever insisting on what is becoming more and more patent to thinking people, that "he who would be free, himself must strike the blow." The initial step is to bring home to the dumb, driven masses that before they enter the Land of Economic Freedom, they must recognise their bondage. Alas! how shall they learn it, while the captains and guides of the coming race are but dimly conscious themselves. The ideal held out by the S.P.G.B. is high—"The World for the Workers." Your petty vexations, the harassing conditions under which you work, the lack of opportunity for self-culture, the reeking schoolroom, the barrack school and battalion classes, the sickening fear of comparative and actual failure are but part of the burden under which all Labour is groaning. If 35 years of Unionism has effected so little for you, might it not be worth while to seriously review the position, and, dominated by a set definiteness of purpose, recognising your position as but units useful units in the great capitalist game of Grab, infuse a more dignified, less cap-in-hand attitude into your Union? The declared reason for the existence of the N.U.T. is the furtherance of the interests of the child. Is there not a danger that it may become the happy hunting-ground of the eloquent Party-man in a hurry to round his own life into a success?

A. REGINALD.

A LOOK ROUND.

DR. EMIL REICH has continued his lectures upon Plato. In the course of the one dealing with "The State and Individual Socialism" he said that we had slavery here as much as it existed in the time of the Greeks. The working men were slaves. It was no use to say: "They are not slaves; they have rights"; for the Athenian slaves had certain rights also.

It is just this bogey of "rights" that leads the members of the working class to consider themselves free. They claim to have the "right" of free speech, the "right" of choosing their employer and their landlord, the "right" of combination; the "right" of recording their vote for one of the master class or for a misleading Labour "Leader" and so on.

Take the "right" of free speech. Does it exist? Is it not a fact that if only three persons congregate in a public place they cause an obstruction within the meaning of the Act? And the many prosecutions and imprisonments which have taken place in connection with this alleged right have conclusively proved that no such right exists.

Then we are told that a man can work for whom he likes and live where he likes. Leaving out of the question the many who cannot work at all, because nobody can find it profitable to employ them, and who consequently cannot pay the rent, where does the "right" of the employed come in?

Does a workman enter a factory, dock or warehouse and say to the employer, "I'm coming here to work, my hours will be from 10 to 5, with 2 off for recreation, no work on Saturdays and my wages will be £4 per week?"

Of course not. When he presents himself at the factory gate he either sees the familiar notice "no hands wanted" and sorrowfully departs, or he humbly enquires if there is any chance of a job. If he gets the welcome "yes" he is told when he must start and when he must finish and what the pay will be. When his employers consider he shall eat, or, at any rate, cease work with that object in view, a bell is rung to denote the fact, and when he is permitted to return the bell is again rung.

And as to the "right" to live where he chooses, this also does not exist. He must of necessity live where and how his economic circumstances determine.

We are all born into this world without being consulted in the matter. We are supposed to belong to our parents. Before we are six weeks old we must be registered, before we are six months old we must be vaccinated, unless our parents have within four months of our birth obtained an exemption order; when we are five we must go to school, and we must not leave school and go to work until the State says we may. If we cannot find work and therefore cannot pay the rent, the landlord has the right to employ the machinery of the law in ejecting us. We then have the right to become an obstruction or a nuisance; if we beg, the policeman has the right to run us in, as he also has if we steal or poach, or wander about without any visible means of subsistence, or sleep out of doors, and if, finally, we give it up as a bad job, and seeing that Capitalist Society will not allow us to live decently, we endeavour to put an end to our miserable existence by jumping from "the bridge of sighs," once again the gentleman in blue has the right to take us into custody and we shall get "time." Where do our "rights" come in?

Either with the object of killing time or of playing the game of bluffing the workers, some Belgians have formed an Association called the "Freedom of Labour Defence." At the inaugural meeting Lady Francis Balfour, who a

few days afterwards was prominent at the Women's Suffrage Demonstrations, presided. Lord Wemyss, a life long defender of the liberty of the propertied few to exploit the propertyless many, gave as his ideal: "Work as long as you like, for what wages you like and for anybody you like." I can see his lordship "a doin' of it." This reminds me of the speech of Lord Salisbury, when Viscount Cranborne. He said: "So long as they are not overworked, all the working classes want is plenty of work," and in order that they may have it, of course, Salisbury, Wemyss & Co. refrain from working themselves. It is the "freedom" of the working class to be exploited that they, the shirkers and exploiters, would defend!

The formation of the Association is due to the Sweating Exhibition organised by the *Daily News*, at which a number of ardent one-step-at-a-time revolutionists like Herbert Burrows, Ramsay MacDonald, Chiozza Money and others have been lecturing to the sweaters on their moral responsibility in this matter. But appeals to this unknown quantity have made many times, and sweating continues. The *Daily News* itself points out that more than half a century ago Charles Kingsley wrote his impeachment of "Cheap Clothes and Nasty." Seven years before this Mrs. Browning in "The Cry of the Children" and Hood in "The Song of the Shirt" had awakened the public conscience to a menacing danger. Civilization has broadened and deepened. England has become a world-State. Science applied to industry has multiplied by twenty-fold the capacities of production. Yet to-day "The Song of the Shirt," the "Cheap Clothes and Nasty," "The Cry of the Children" still remain. Women are still working their lives into the fabric of shirts and Bibles, and children are labouring in home industries "who have never known the sunshine nor the glory that is brighter than the sun." All the large processes of change, the accumulated wealth of Empire, spoil gotten from all the seven seas, has brought no mitigation and no hope to these unfortunates.

The *Daily News* could not have penned a better indictment of Reform had it tried. Revolution, and Revolution alone, will be effective.

Seventeen syndicates in the French Engineering Trades, including the Iron and Steel Trades, the machine-making trade in all its varieties, the cycle trade, the hardware trade, and others—have formed themselves into a Confederation in opposition to the Workmen's Union. They declare that the attitude of the Workmen's Federation, which is now revolutionary, leaves them no alternative but to found a Confederation of their own.

It is inevitable that, as the Class War intensifies, as the final struggle between the master class and the working class approaches, changes must take place in the organisation and methods of both armies. Just in proportion as the Socialist Party impress the working class by their propaganda, so the latter, becoming class-conscious, will recognise that the form of Trade Union that has served a purpose in the past, and which is based upon the superstition of the brotherhood of capital and labour, is unsuited to present day conditions.

It is the function of The Socialist Party to prepare the working class for the Revolution and to build up the necessary organisation. Some of our friends, tired of the vote-catching dodges of alleged "Socialist" candidates, disheartened at the slow rate of progress, disgusted at the large number of good men gone wrong after being elected to legislative and administrative bodies, declare for an industrial organisation, having for its object the taking and holding of the means of life, without affiliation to any political party. And it is not to be wondered at that some of the more impatient are reviving the Anarchist doctrine of the futility of Parliamentarism and are advocating an economic organisation alone, with its ultimate general strike, or, as it is now being put, the general lock-out of the master class.

It looks very alluring, but do not let us forget that the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, is an instrument of oppression. Is it wise to leave that instrument in the hands of the capitalist class? No. The Socialist Union must work in conjunction with The Socialist Party.

There are others who are of opinion that the new economic organisation should not be called a Socialist Union, as its object being "the taking and holding of the means of wealth production," it would be sufficiently stamped as a Socialist Union without mention of that word.

Some of these very folks, however, have denounced those who have pursued a similar policy in electoral contests, and I think justly so. I have before me now the election address of Mr. T. R. Wall, who, although a member of the S.D.F., contested a seat on the Fulham Borough Council as "The Labour Candidate" and whose election address stated the Socialist position whilst carefully refraining from avowing it as such. To oppose men who do this on the political field and assist them to do a similar thing on the industrial field is illogical and confusing.

Last month John Burns was elected a member of the National Liberal Club. What an affecting sight it must have been when he first encountered those members of the Club who are also members of the S.D.F., viz., H. M. Hyndman, E. Belfort Bax, J. F. Green, A. S. Headingley, etc. Every candidate for the Club, before being elected, must take a pledge that he will support the principles of the Liberal Party.

In a recent issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD we gave details of the compacts entered into between candidates of the Independent Labour Party and the Liberals at the General Election. In the *Labour Leader* for Sept. 9th, 1904, Mr. J. Keir Hardie wrote "Temporary tactical understandings with, say, the Irish Party, or any other independent section of politicians I can understand, but a working agreement with Liberals or Conservatives would spell ruin." In view of this utterance it is easy to understand why the recent "working agreements with Liberals" were not mentioned in the *Labour Leader*.

"Importation of Chinese Stopped" was the double column headline in the *Daily News* for December 22nd, 1905, above the report of Sir H. Campbell Bannerman's speech at the Albert Hall. It was there that he stated the Government's conclusion to stop forthwith the recruitment and embarkation of Coolies in China for South Africa. At that time there were 47,217 Coolies employed; at the end of February the number had risen to 49,995, and in the three months the desertions had nearly doubled. Thus have the Liberals carried out the promise "No Slavery under the Liberal Flag."

I know that Bannerman said that the importation should be stopped as "far as practicable," and no doubt some Liberals will argue that this has been done. But it was practicable to stop it in December. The *Daily News* of May 19th admitted that "of course, the present Ministers might have withdrawn the permits just as they might have ordered the repatriation of the Coolies already there. There was no physical impossibility in either case." And the *Western Morning News* pointed out in January that "the Transvaal being a Crown Colony, the Home Government could, if it chose, cancel the Chinese Labour Ordinance, and send every Chinaman back to China." But, of course, they didn't, and there are now more Coolies in S. Africa than at any previous time. The lie, however, like other Liberal lies, served its purpose.

On May 25th a complimentary banquet was given to Mr. W. M. Thompson, Editor of *Reynolds'*, at the National Liberal Club. Hobnobbing with the titled participants were Messrs. H. M. Hyndman, E. Belfort Bax, and A. E. Fletcher. The Rt. Hon. John Burns was the principle speaker, and was followed by Mr. H. Hyndman! Oh, these revolutionary S.D.F.'ers! J. KAY.

THE APPEAL TO DIVES.

TO THE glory of the *Daily News* and the increase of its circulation, a "Sweating Exhibition" was opened in the early days of last month, under the distinguished patronage of certain serene or royal highnesses who were graciously pleased to express their heartfelt sympathy with the condition of the victims of the system which their royal highnesses are also pleased to uphold, and of which they are the more or less picturesque figure-heads. We read that when she saw these brave workers Princess Henry was moved several times to say, "Oh, terrible! terrible! terrible!" and again "Shocking! shocking! shocking!" And these ejaculations seem to have so greatly affected the *Daily News* gentlemen that they forgot to reject the advertisement which has appeared at intervals in their journal check by jowl with the lavishly worded reports of the proceedings of their Sweating Exhibition—a large displayed advertisement which sets out the advantages of somebody's suits at 21s.

All through the month of May the exhibition has, with the assistance of a weirdly polyglot committee of high church dignitaries, low church ecclesiastics, broad church clerics, nonconformist church pillars and a host of laymen of every church and no church—a committee ranging from my lord bishop to plain Harry Quelch—kept its doors open. The well-to-do folk in goodly numbers have followed the lead of the royal personages and passed through the tastefully arranged hall and after closely inspecting the horrors of sweating with all the horrors carefully eliminated, have passed out again having remarked "oh, terrible! terrible!" and also "dreadful! dreadful!" which it seems is the proper thing to say in the circumstances. And the soul of the *Daily News* has been much gratified therewith; and the sweated workers on exhibition have (vide the *Daily News*) been equally gratified; and the columns of the *Daily News* have been filled with much good "copy"; and a firm has written expressing their great indignation that the boxes used by them should have been discovered in process of manufacture under sweating conditions and has donated a sum to the exhibition; and the *Daily News* has secured a wide and valuable advertisement out of the undertaking; and what with one thing and another it has been most excellent good business.

It was a great idea to fix upon the West End for the show. It was done purposely to attract the well-to-do. All that the well-to-do wanted was to have their consciences shaken up a little. Once effect that, and something was bound to happen. It was useless going to a poor neighbourhood as had been proven by the lack of success of the previous exhibition which had been holden in the East End. The conscience of England, rich England, that is not poor England which does not matter, could not be reached from the East End. Certainly much interest was aroused by the East End Exhibition. Representatives of large firms unable to understand how their trade rivals could undersell them, came and were astounded at what they saw. It cleared the air for them and they went away no longer seeing as through a glass darkly. Yet the sweating did not stop. On the contrary, it seemed to increase. Perhaps it was that the City firms, knowing their rivals' secret, had been forced to adopt their methods. Its a poor Exhibition out of which nobody gets a wrinkle.

Therefore, the *Daily News* show came to the West End in order to lash the moral consciences of the rich and if a West End conscience expresses itself under the lash in "shockings" and "terribles" the show has done it. The *Daily News* people at any rate have no doubt about it. Their Exhibition "has rendered a great service to humanity;" it has successfully appealed to the moral conscience of England and has raised such a storm of indignation that, if the land is not filled with fugitive sweaters hastening without the revengeful reach of relent-

less wrath, it clearly ought to be.

Nevertheless, the truth compels the admission that sweating still continues and must continue so long as the worker is compelled to sell his or her labour-power on the market as a commodity and has no control over the disposal of the wealth which the labour of the worker alone produces. Just because it is inevitable that the exigencies of profit manufacture,—the necessary accompaniment of capitalism,—should demand that a large proportion of labour should be redundant on the market; just because, that is, capitalist production would be impossible without an army of unemployed to keep wages down, it is inevitable that the pressure of want should force numbers of these workers to sell their labour-power at starvation prices. Not all the waves of indignation and "moral feeling" that can be conjured out of a community, can affect that result even though the community were ten thousand times more susceptible to "moral" appeals than English people are. Given capitalism, there is no escape from the mind-blunting, heart-racking misery which the annals of toil show as their dominant and most persistent feature.

Exhibitions such as the *Daily News* has organised are useless—worse than useless, because the only effect they have or can have is to temporarily stimulate the flow of ludicrously impotent dribbles of charity to the end that the evil plight of those unhappy persons whose condition has been brought under notice, may be in some measure palliated, and the time when drastic and adequate action may be taken, delayed. To delay that time may or may not be the deliberate intention of charity dispensers and their following, but it is indisputable that their action contributes to the dissemination of the idea that there exists a "moral conscience" which when occasion demands, can take on tangible soup-and-blanket expression sufficient to satisfy the immediate demands of the acutely impoverished. In other words, the response of the charitable is the excuse for Governmental indifference to the poverty problem, is the force that blunts the agitation of those concerned to press that problem upon a reluctant public attention and, what is of far greater importance from our point of view, helps to obscure that class issue which it is our business as a Socialist Party to keep boldly defined, and so fosters confusion in the minds of the working class. As against the *Daily News* and its circulation raising sensationalism, we urge that nothing short of the overthrow of capitalism itself and the establishment of Socialism can effect the eradication of poverty and all its attendant horrors. Only when the working class understand that they are poor because they have no control over the machinery of wealth production and, therefore, have no control over the wealth which they alone produce; only when they have recognised that fact and appreciated the unalterable antagonism existing between themselves and the capitalist class in control of the machinery of wealth production, which that fact necessarily connotes, only then will they understand that by organisation on class lines and by waging unceasing war upon the dominant class until they have achieved complete victory and secured possession of political power and through that the possession also of the means of life can they ensure for themselves freedom from the possibility always present with them to-day, of reduction to the ranks of the sweated and even below. Until then, the fear of abject poverty will haunt them perpetually. Until then, sweating, as even a *Daily News* writer has been obliged to confess, will continue. The leopard cannot change its spots nor the Ethiopian his skin. An appeal to either to do so would not be more preposterous than the appeal to capitalism to abolish sweating is.

A.G.A.

On the ground of the class struggle we are invincible; if we leave it we are lost, because we are no longer Socialists. The strength and power of Socialism rest in the fact that we are leading a class struggle; that the labouring class is exploited and oppressed by the capitalist class, and that within capitalist society effectual reforms, which will put an end to class government and class exploitation, are impossible.

W. LIEBKNECHT.

DO WE MOVE?

How it is possible for people to still hold, as so many do, that what is has always been and must be, is very difficult to understand. This difficulty is increased when the rapidity with which change follows change is realised, along with the size and importance of the changes themselves. The vast alterations that have taken place in our social life through the linking of place to place by networks of railways in a manner undreamt of less than two generations ago; the ease and facility with which one is enabled to travel over great distances of land and sea and the equal ease with which goods can be carried, have practically resulted in the annihilation of distance as any great barrier between the peoples of the world. So much so, indeed, that the most lengthy journeys that would, but a comparatively short time ago, have been attended with a host of uncertainties and dangers are now undertaken as pleasure trips. The development of the telephonic and telegraphic systems has still further removed the difficulties and disabilities of distance. To-day news reaches us in a few hours that would have necessitated but yesterday a long sea trip lasting perhaps many months. Our postal system and its facilities for communication are essentially of recent date. The days of stage-coaches and horse travel are not so far distant as some are prone to imagine.

To mention a few such changes suggests a host of others of a similar nature that will amply illustrate the fact that we are constantly going through a process of development and improvement. Each fresh addition suggests some further one, and like the proverbial snowball, the rapidity of growth increases with the growth itself.

Such developments, as those of transit, etc. which have been instanced, are not without their effect in other directions. Everything that tends in the direction of rendering more accessible a place that previously was inaccessible makes that place more eligible as a market for exporting countries. The spur thus given to competition among capitalists for the new market would hasten economic development and render more efficient the means and methods of producing wealth.

The altering social conditions resulting from any change in economic relations have been too frequently stated to need repetition here. Suffice it to say, that with the growth of the market catered for, grows also the scale on which production is conducted. The larger the business the greater are the economies effected through the medium of the sub-division of labour and the introduction of more and more perfect machinery. Such economic developments result in increasing the co-operative and social nature of production. The way is paved for the trust and the combine, which render still more necessary and easy the collective ownership and control of such industries, in place of the private ownership of such essentially social concerns.

The rapidity of development in the last half century (so insignificant a period in the history of the world and society), and the recognition of the fact that the speed increases rather than decreases, points to yet more startling and far-reaching developments in the future, which, with the conscious co-operation of the working class in the direction dictated by the development itself, will culminate in the readjustment of the Social structure to its altered economic basis, while some people are still mumbling "things are as they were, and will so remain."

D. K.

At the 25th Annual Meeting of the Land Nationalisation Society held last month, Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., said he had fought his own election almost entirely on the land question. Mr. Will Crooks also spoke as did Mr. Franklin Thomasson, Mr. A. H. Scott and other Liberal M.P's.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed:—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.



SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1906.

THE COUNTESS OF WARWICK AND JOHN BURNS.

A CONSIDERABLE amount of interest appears to have been aroused by a statement which appeared in a recent number of this journal to the effect that the lady who came down from her exalted position to become a member of the lowly S.D.F. (the Countess of Warwick) sent a telegram to the gentleman who left his lowly position as a member of the S.D.F. to ascend to an exalted sphere (the Right Honourable John Burns) regretting her inability to attend one of his election meetings, and wishing him success. We have received quite a number of communications on the subject, and have been requested to state the grounds upon which the statement was made. Our correspondents appear to be astonished that a member of the S.D.F. should have taken a course so entirely opposed to the attitude of that body, and apparently are unable to understand why, if such a telegram was sent, the organisation has taken no steps to repudiate either the member or the action. So far as we are concerned, however, the only cause for surprise lies in the fact that there is evidently still a number of persons who see in the incident something incongruous—persons who, it would seem, are students of, or at any rate interested in, contemporary English politics. We can only commend to them a perusal of back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD and the pamphlet called the Manifesto of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, wherein they will find a record of many incidents of a similar character. Not only are members of the S.D.F. continually taking public action opposed to the policy for the time being of that organisation, but the organisation itself is continually taking action in flat contradiction to its professed principles. In the matter of John Burns his attitude to-day is one of virulent denunciation, but to-morrow it would not be a surprising thing if it were the complete opposite. On the contrary, it would be strictly in accordance with precedent. In the past it has roundly trounced the Right Honourable gentleman and a week or two afterwards supported him, although his attitude was unchanged, just as in the past it has been engaged in roundly trouncing the capitalist party Burns is a member of, while its members and branches have been actively engaged in assisting the candidatures of representatives of that party. Sufficient evidence to satisfy the most hard-shelled unbeliever can be found in the file of this paper and the Manifesto mentioned.

Therefore we say that neither the present

action of the Countess nor the lack of action of the S.D.F. is ground for incredulity. Indeed, there is less ground in this instance than in many others of a similar nature, because in the other cases the members concerned were just common or garden persons while the Countess is an exceedingly valuable asset. Her personality and associations secure for the S.D.F. most useful advertisement (much to the very pronounced disgust of the I.L.P., which regards itself as the refuge *par excellence* for all aristocratic and plutocratic persons with bees in their bonnets or democratic yearnings in their hearts, and is naturally incensed that the S.D.F. should have poached upon its preserves to such good purpose). Besides which has it not been told in Gath that "a mere drawerful of jewels" has been at the S.D.F.'s disposal? Very well then; why should the S.D.F. take action? Why should it risk a trump card?

But if our correspondents want the evidence they may have it. We only hope its publication may serve as a further justification for our opposition to the S.D.F. and similar bodies, and by establishing a fact in proof of the supine, vacillating and confusing attitude of that organisation, help to direct the working-class mind to the consideration of the only principles and the only policy upon which a working-class party capable of effecting those social changes which alone will remove poverty and all its concomitant evils from out of working-class experience, can be built up—the principles and policy of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, as summarised on the front page of this paper.

This is the evidence:—

(1) Several members of this Party were present at the meeting and heard the telegram read (names and addresses can be supplied if desired).

(2) Our Comrade Fitzgerald, speaking at Battersea on the Sunday following, was challenged by Mr. Archer, a prominent supporter of Burns, who, under the impression that Fitzgerald was a member of the S.D.F., demanded to know why he (Fitzgerald) was opposing Burns when the Countess was supporting him according to the telegram he (Archer) heard read at Burns' meeting.

(3) The written statement of Mr. J. H. Brown, Hon. Sec. of Burns' Election Committee, who informs us that he received application to reserve seats on the platform of Burns' meeting for Lady Warwick and friends; that Lady Warwick was unable to attend and sent a telegram of regret etc.

(4) A written communication from Mr. W. Rines (Mayor of Battersea) whose recollection was that some such telegram was received and read.

(5) The report of the Battersea Borough News, Jan. 12th, 1906, which concludes: "Telegrams expressing regret at their inability to attend were received from Lady Warwick and Lady Collins."

For our purposes statements 1 and 2 (the reports of our own members of public incidents well within the knowledge of the large audiences of both Burns' and Fitzgerald's meetings) are good enough. Statements 3, 4 and 5 only confirm and amplify those reports. Our correspondents may consider all of them in conjunction with the fact that another prominent member of the S.D.F. (its treasurer, Mr. J. F. Green) speaking at Hammersmith on April 22, informed his audience that they had only one "working man" in the Cabinet who could not do much by himself, and that what they wanted was to send another six working men to help him from, which we conclude that, according to Mr. Green, the S.D.F. is all wrong, and that there is nothing deplorable about Mr. Burns' position except that there is not more of him!

WHY MR. H. QUELCH RESIGNED.
We intended dealing with the matter of the resignation of Mr. H. Quelch from the Chairmanship of the London Trades Council last month, but the April issue of the *Trades and Labour Gazette*, containing the official report, did not reach us until we were going to press.

Mr. H. Quelch announced his resignation at the ordinary meeting of the Council, held at the Club Union Hall, on March 8th, after a letter had been read from John Burns, sincerely thanking the Council for its expression of congratulation on his appointment to the Cabinet.

He (Mr. Quelch) wished to announce that he did not propose to offer himself for re-election to the chairmanship. In his opinion the chairmanship ought to be the official mouth-piece and representative of the Council as a whole. In view of the decision of the last meeting, when the Council repudiated the whole of his cherished convictions and stultified itself by repudiating all the principles which had been supposed to guide it during the whole of the period that he had been associated with it, it was obviously incompatible that he should retain his position. He did not propose to retire from the Council unless the society whom he represented, the Printers' Warehousemen—he did not represent the Socialists—declined to elect him.

The italics are ours.
Mr. Quelch, editor of "the Organ of the Social Democracy," member of the S.D.F. Executive, does not represent the Socialists. In his capacity as a trade union representative he has sunk his Socialist principles and has supported Liberal-Labour candidates, both for Parliament and the L.C.C., whilst in his capacity as Editor of *Justice* and member of the S.D.F. Executive he has opposed them. Could anything be more absurd and more calculated to confuse the minds of the working class? And seeing that Burns is no worse than Steadman, whom Mr. Quelch and the S.D.F. have supported, why all this fuss over Burns? Both are "firmly caught in the nets of the Liberal Party." They were already caught at the election of 1900, when the S.D.F. supported them, and the position at the last election, when Mr. Quelch denounced Burns but supported Steadman, was unchanged.

We are glad, however, to see that Mr. Quelch is beginning to recognise how "obviously incompatible" is his position. It is charged against us that our persistent criticism of his actions in these columns has in large measure contributed to his awakening. We take the flattering unctious to our soul and hope that he will soon see further and decline to sit on a body obeying the behests of a trade union when those behests are in flat contradiction to the Socialist principles and policy that he professes. If we have been the humble means whereby one erring Social Democrat, albeit he a leader, has seen the error of some of his ways, we have not lived in vain, and we will go forward hopefully, confident that others, equally erring, will eventually forsake the broad road that leadeth unto personal power but working-class confusion, and plant their feet firmly on the narrow path that leadeth direct to the triumph of Socialism.

THE SOCIAL LADDER.

Those who were at the top of the social ladder, or half-way up, must help those who were at the bottom. If they did not do so they must expect that some day the ladder would be pulled away.

W. CROOKS, 4.5.06.

The first part of the pronouncement is quite up to the Crooks standard, and assumes, like the statement familiar to every school-boy that "every lad can become a Lord Chancellor if he likes," that there is plenty of room for everybody on top of the social ladder. Which even the school-boy himself, to-day, recognises as the acme of absurdity. The idea of Society being likened to a ladder at all is confusing. It presupposes that the whole of Society is on the ladder, whereas the fact is that the bulk of Society forms the base upon which the ladder rests. Even social ladders must be planted on something. Only infinitesimal fragments of Society occupy the rungs, fragments which grow smaller by degrees and beautifully less the higher they get. Clearly, therefore, the fragments on the ladder could not help any appreciable portion of the bulk below into a more elevated position because to do so would render the base upon which the ladder rests exceedingly unstable and the position of the fragments most unhappily precarious. And even if this were not so it would be quite palpably impossible to assist any notable number on to the bottom rungs already overcrowded, without pushing off some of those already on or forcing them higher; and as the economy of ladders precludes the possibility of any overweight at the top, the fragments of Society already there must be unceremoniously cuffed or pushed off by those forced up from

EMIGRATION.

below or the whole ladder must lose its balance and come toppling to the ground. Therefore the main concern of those on top, as well as those on the lower rungs, is to prevent the base from shifting.

We do not think Mr. Crooks is so desperately baffle-headed as not to understand that. As a matter of fact he makes it fairly apparent that he *does* understand in the last part of his remark. If those who are on the ladder do not help those at the bottom they must not be surprised if presently the ladder itself is pulled away.

Precisely. And the exact difference between Mr. Crooks and ourselves is that we are out to pull the ladder away by inciting the working class at the base to view it as not less than an unmitigated nuisance at the best and as a crushing burden at the worst, a ladder up which they cannot climb anyhow, while Mr. Crooks is out to inspire the working-class at the base with the idea that the ladder is a great institution up which they may climb if they are good and virtuous, what time he points out to those on the ladder that if they are to maintain their position they must fill the working-class base with the idea that they (the ladder persons) are very sympathetic and only anxious to lend a hand to help them (the working class base) up the rungs. In other words Mr. William Crooks, M.P., like his friend, Mr. John Burns, M.P., is playing a double game.

TOTTENHAM BRANCH REPORT.

LIKE our comrades of West Ham reported in last month's SOCIALIST STANDARD, we are neither dead nor asleep. We have held our propaganda meetings every Sunday morning and evening all through the Winter at West Green Corner, with very gratifying results, our Comrade Anderson upholding the position of the Party against all comers, from the defenders of Total Abstinence to Universal Perpetualism, as well as the other usual "political" opponents, all of whom have alike had to depart, defeated.

The Branch membership is growing and the sale of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is steadily increasing, over 100 copies having now been sold at one meeting.

A few weeks ago a meeting supposed to be in aid of the Hensworth Miners (who had been locked out some 87 weeks) was held at our station. Three local Councillors were to speak, and when the chairman had opened the meeting one of them proceeded to address the crowd. But instead of speaking of, or on behalf of, the miners, he (presumably from force of habit) talked about himself and his activity—or want of it—on the local Education Committee.

Realising the trick, we planted our platform some little distance away, and very soon the people were around it, listening and applauding as our speaker showed how the poverty of the miners of Hensworth and elsewhere, inevitably under capitalism, could be cured, but only by Socialism.

The attempt of the local parish pump politicians to take advantage of the sufferings of those people to advertise their own peculiar brand of "progressive labourism" met with signal disaster, and, losing their entire audience, all they could do was to come and ask us for a collection for them. This was refused, but they were invited to send a statement of their case with any request to our Head Office, where, we assured them, it would be generously considered—but nothing more has been heard of them.

Under the auspices of the North London District Council we have started our Thursday night meetings at St. Ann's Road, and have met with that kind of opposition we had thought was a thing of the past, a section of the shopocracy of the neighbourhood engineering the trouble. One night one of them displayed his intelligence and skill by walking round and round the meeting blowing a penny trumpet. As this, however, did not succeed in spoiling our meeting, a professional cornet player was brought up and a chorus of half-a-dozen assisted him in making an infernal row. Some thought they were singing; nevertheless our meeting went on, and although at our last one an even more dirty attack was tried we held our ground, and finishing up with three rousing cheers for Free Speech, we assured all interested that we would be there again next Thursday—and we will.

H.A.V.

The March issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD contained a letter sent to one of our comrades by a friend who had gone to Canada to "escape poverty" in the land of the West, describing the conditions he found existing there for the working class. These facts, which could have been supplemented by the communications received by others of our members, were timely in face of the long depression that has existed in the trade and commerce of this country for the last five years, and which has led to the booming of the theory of emigration as a cure for the poverty and misery existing here. Railway Companies, Shipping Companies and "Free Labour" providers like Mr. Graeme Hunter, have turned many a penny if not honest, at least useful by the rush of the workless, and those afraid of being workless, across the sea. Glowing accounts of the country and its prosperity are widely advertised by these interested persons, and the brilliant prospects for the "industrious" worker are dangled before the eyes of the unwary or unthinking like the bunch of carrots before the donkey. When these efforts are not sufficiently successful, then a prominent "Labour Leader" like Mr. Ben Tillett is engaged to travel this country lecturing upon the glorious conditions for the working-class existing in Australia, and it is the truth that these various agencies reach a much larger number of the people than the occasional accounts of the real situation can, under the circumstances, possibly do.

Still the seed sometimes reaches good ground and in response to an enquiry, a few remarks on the general question of emigration may be useful.

The question may be viewed from three different points. Firstly, that of analogy; secondly, the economic conditions in the countries emigrated to; and, thirdly, the reasons for emigrating.

Under the first heading we may say that if emigration as such were a cure, or even a palliation, to any extent worth considering of the poverty of the working class, then Ireland should be the most prosperous country on the planet. For over fifty years her sons and daughters have streamed across the oceans to the continent of the West or to the land down under the Southern Cross, until to-day the population numbers about four and a half millions, while four millions of people have left her shores in that period. With what result? The working class of Ireland, particularly the agricultural labourers, are even worse off than the workers here! With such an example at our very doors, we are asked by the smooth-tongued agents of the ruling class to believe that if some of our fellow-workers cross the ocean all will be well with those remaining!

"But," it may be objected, "those who went away benefited by so doing." Let us see. The countries usually emigrated to are America, Australia and New Zealand. Although South Africa is sometimes counted, the unsettled conditions still prevailing there—to say nothing of the large number of Chinese—renders it advisable for us to leave this territory out of the present consideration. What are the general conditions prevailing in the countries named? In essentials, similar to those we have here, that is, capitalism rules there with all its consequences as we know them here. While the standard of living and wages are slightly higher in America than here, they are more than counterbalanced by the speeding up and greater driving that exist there and which result in throwing the worker on the scrap heap at an earlier age than occurs here. "Too old at 35" is an intensely real cry in that go-ahead land, and this, coupled with the increasing use of machinery in all industries, thereby dispensing with men or filling their places with women and children, creates an ever increasing army of relatively redundant and, therefore, unemployed workers; so much so, that America can show as large a number unemployed, comparatively, as any old country; while the march of Coney's Army to Washington will still be fresh in the memories of many here. The emigrant thus finds that he has left one set of capitalist conditions to go into a similar set elsewhere.

Thus we see that there is an abundance of raw material (land), of instruments of production (machines, mills, etc.), of means of transport and of workers to operate all these things, yet we have poverty and misery. Why? Because all these means of life are owned and controlled by a comparatively small section of Society—the capitalist class.

Australia, as far as its industrial sections are concerned, which are the only sections the mass of the emigrants can exist in, has for years been troubled with the question of poverty and unemployment. At the very moment Mr. Ben Tillett was endeavouring to persuade the workers to go to Australia, all the large cities and towns there were discussing "what to do with the unemployed," while the various reports, including both the "Labour" papers and emigrants who have returned, show that the struggle for existence and the prospects thereof, differ in no essential from the same struggle undergone here. "General" Booth's wily scheme to deport some of our unemployed to the region known as "Pilgrimage Scrub," where, as was shown at the time, water scarcely exists and the soil is all sand, totally incapable of producing anything to support life, seems to have been dropped for the present, but may well be borne in mind when the firm of Booth and Sons move again in the matter.

Thus, Australia offers no escape from the conditions of poverty and lack of employment that the emigrant thinks to flee from, but simply alters his position geographically while leaving it economically just as it was.

In New Zealand we have a country about twice the area of Great Britain with a population of just under 800,000. Certain reforms clamoured for here by several parties are in existence there, such as State ownership of the land, Labour Colonies, etc. Yet, with all these "advantages," they are not more successful in dealing with the problem of unemployment and poverty than those in charge of affairs at home. Tom Mann, after spending some time in the colony and travelling in various parts, came to the conclusion that New Zealand was as much in need of Socialism as the Mother Country.

No matter then, in which direction we turn, we find the arguments in favour of emigration fall to the ground when confronted with the facts of the circumstances existing in the countries where the emigrant is urged to go. And this brings us to the third heading—the cause for emigration. The answer of course is poverty or dread of unemployment.

But this is only a surface answer, and in itself asks another question—Why are the workers poor? The answer to this latter question will contain the solution of the problem.

It will be admitted, generally, that if a person has a right to stay on any portion of this globe, he has the right to stay in the country where he was born, and before being driven out of that country, it should, at least, be shown that the country is unable to support him—or, rather, allow him to support himself. Can this be shown of England? Take first the raw material in the shape of land. Is it all occupied, or cultivated, or being worked? So little so, that millions of acres are uncultivated and large areas are kept for non-productive purposes, such as game preserves, deer parks, etc. The warehouses and stores are filled with machines and tools ready to be used for the conversion of this raw material into articles for man's use and enjoyment, while large numbers of mechanics are available, nay, anxious to be employed in producing more machines and tools if those existent are not sufficient. Are the means of transport inadequate? According to the statements of those favouring Railway Nationalisation half the trains run empty now, and while the goods trucks are obsolete and clumsy, they could, even as they are, transport far larger quantities than they do at present.

Many miles of canals have been bought up by the Railway Companies for the purpose of stilling competition and are almost unused, while those still operating are by no means overburdened with traffic. Evidently then, the means of transport, if not ideal, are at least adequate, and here, as with the machines, we have a large supply of workers at hand ready to extend or improve these means of transport should it be decided to act in that direction.

We thus see that there is an abundance of raw material (land), of instruments of production (machines, mills, etc.), of means of transport and of workers to operate all these things, yet we have poverty and misery. Why? Because all these means of life are owned and controlled by a comparatively small section of Society—the capitalist class.

The workers have no means of living, except

by selling their abilities—or power to work, which means themselves—to such members of the ruling class as care to employ them. As the capitalists are only concerned with wringing profits out of the labour of those they employ, which again depends upon their selling the articles produced, it follows that the capitalist will only employ the workers in accordance with the demands of the markets for commodities.

To-day wealth is produced in much larger quantities with relatively fewer workers than at any previous period of the world's history. Every increase in the speeding up of the workers, every improvement in the present or introduction of new machinery, and every further application of science to industry, results in a still smaller number of workers being required to produce the same, or even a larger, amount of wealth than before. This, of course, applies wherever capitalism exists, and the attempts to escape results by flying to similar conditions in another clime necessarily fail in every case.

The solution of the difficulty stands out clear from the answer given above. As the workers produce all the wealth and are the only useful class in modern Society, they must take the means of life, in all its branches, into their own hands, to be under their own control, for their own benefit. In other words, only by establishing a Socialist Commonwealth can they abolish the poverty, misery and unemployment which the masters' agents to-day tell them can be avoided by emigration.

J. FITZGERALD.

To carry on the work of organising "The Manufacturers' Association of Great Britain," a provisional committee has been formed, and includes such well-known manufacturers as Colonel Sir John E. Bingham, Bart. (Messrs. Walker and Hall), Sir Joseph Lawrence (Lino-type and Machinery, Limited), Mr. G. Byng (General Electric Company, Limited), Mr. R. K. Morcom (Messrs. Bellis and Morcom), Mr. Hugo Hirst (Robertson Lamp Company, Limited), Mr. W. C. Mountain (Messrs. Ernest Scott and Mountain), and Mr. H. H. D. Anderson (Associated Portland Cement Manufacturers (1900), Ltd.).

A fundamental principle of the association, it is asserted, will be that party politics in every form shall be rigidly excluded. The movement is receiving the support of many of the leading manufacturing firms, and the members already enrolled are said to represent many millions of invested capital.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

L.G. (Reading).—It was in August, 1902, that the S.D.F. Conference, acting on the recommendation of its Executive Council, decided to withdraw from the L.R.C., and it was not until February, 1903, that the L.R.C. Conference decided that in future all candidates run under its auspices should be designated Labour Candidates only. The statement by Mr. H. Quelch, at the Amsterdam Congress, to the effect that the only objection that the S.D.F. had to the L.R.C. was its refusal to allow candidates who claimed to be Socialists to run as such was somewhat misleading.

W.H.M. (Merthyr).—The attitude of the I.L.P. on the Class War may be seen from the following: "We refuse to utter the shibboleth of 'the class war,' and we remain loyal to the non-Socialist Labour Representation Committee."

"Labour Leader, Editorial on 'The Amsterdam Congress,' Aug. 26, 1904.

"I denounced it" (the Class War dogma) "as a reactionary and whiggish precept, certain to lead the movement away from the real aims of Socialism."

[J. Bruce Glasier, in same issue

COMRADE (Tooting).—If possible will deal with the matter referred to in next issue.

Branch Secretaries and others
SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

REFLECTIONS.

A LETTER in *Justice* from one whose identity is hidden, reads, "I am one of about 12 Socialists who have decided to study Socialism. We all favour the S.D.F. programme and want to start an S.D.F. Branch here." Twelve "Socialists" who haven't studied Socialism want to join the S.D.F. When those twelve "Socialists" have studied Socialism and have discovered that they are Socialists, they will not want to join the S.D.F. They will want to join a Socialist Party. At present, as they have not studied Socialism, they cannot claim to be Socialists. Nevertheless, they may, without incongruity join the S.D.F., because the S.D.F. isn't a Socialist organisation.

In addition to this, "one of twelve," there appears to be quite a number of other members of the S.D.F. who want to study Socialism. They write asking for economic classes. Evidently they are unaware that conductors of economic classes are far from *persona grata* with the S.D.F. leaders. At least one conductor has been expelled the organisation for no greater crime.

Does any one know what has become of the *Justice* crusade against motor-cars? There was a time only a few short months ago, when readers of that Journal were urged to walk the roads with loaded pistols in one pocket and bags of caltrops in the other. The caltrops were to spread in the path of the rushing motor. If this did not have the effect of bursting the tyres, the pistol was to be used. If the shot missed the tyre and hit the occupant, so much the better. Since the advent of the red car and her ladyship, however, pistols and caltrops and even tin-tacks are, apparently, taboo; which may, of course, be only a coincidence, although if political action reflects economic conditions (Socialists who have not studied Socialism may not understand this) there may be something more in it.

Somebody must have told *Justice* I was to refer to the foregoing, or it must have been conveyed to Clerkenwell by some telepathic process. Anyhow, it had hardly been written when our contemporary erupted in the same place again. From which it may be inferred that the notorious red motor has followed the "mere drawerful of jewels" to the sale room. If it hasn't her ladyship must proceed with caution. Otherwise it may occur that she will drive unwittingly into a trap laid by the wily S.D.F.ers, under the inspiration of Mr. Quelch, to treat all motorists in the Swiss fashion (which we understand to be something drastic). Imagine the excitement if, while touring with, say, Bill Thorne, the Countess was to be potted by her own comrades!

Mention of Bill reminds me that since the day when he achieved fame by making his debut as M.P. at St. Stephens in a very large hat of the uncompromising "Alpine or Trilby" variety, he has dropped almost completely out of sight. This need not necessarily be reckoned against him for unrighteousness. Bill is a big man, and it must have meant a real effort on his part to obscure himself. Moreover, he may have profited by the horrible examples which some of his fellow members of the "Labour" Party in their endeavours to impress their statesmanship upon the House, have succeeded in making of themselves. However that may be, I am sure he has disappointed many of his friends, who expected him to do great things as the only M.P. the S.D.F. can allege connection with. And really the acquisition of a large hat and a readiness to write advertisements for books on the hire purchase system, are not much to show as the result of several months labours.

This advertisement writing, by the way, does not appear to be regarded favourably by the *Labour Leader*. The organ of the I.L.P. waxed

indignant with those "Labour" members who have lent their photographs and their strong approbation to the firm who are widely advertising the sale of books by easy payments. The *Labour Leader* does not approve of such action and expresses its disapproval in no mild manner. We fear, however, the Labour Members assailed will not be greatly impressed, seeing that the *Labour Leader* has itself accepted advertisements from the same firm for the same set of books (as well as from other firms for other commodities), and seeing that its columns have for months contained a puff for a certain musical instrument from Mr. Keir Hardie. The I.L.P. organ should shew cause why the *Labour Leader* paper may augment its income by advertisements and why the "Labour" leader person may not do the same thing for the same reason. And it must shew wherein a musical instrument puff by Keir Hardie differs from a book puff by Will Thorne. If it does not, Mr. Thorne may fairly dismiss its criticism as, to put it mildly cant.

This question of how to raise the financial wind seems, on the surface, to strike "Labour" journals and leaders in different ways. I say on the surface because it is fairly clear that at bottom there is no difference at all. *Justice* for example is quite frankly unconcerned as to the source of its income. "Get it," it says, "honestly if you can, of course—but get it." And *Justice* is far from satisfied with the success of its endeavours up to the present. The £500 realised by the sale of the Countess's jewels was very nice and very welcome. But a donation of £1000 would be better. *Justice* is sure that the S.D.F. can give better value for the money than any other organisation afloat; which may or may not be true. At any rate, its S.D.F. will have to manage better than they did at Cambridge, if they want to inspire persons with thousands of pounds to spare, to donate large sums to its treasury. Large sums are never given without conditions, and when the donor requires those conditions to be kept dark it is unpleasant, to say the least of it, to discover that the recipient of the largess does not possess "political aptitude" sufficient to keep inquisitive noses from scenting the game.

OBSERVER.

IF THEY KNEW!

A LETTER describing certain grievances of Railway Workers has been sent to a writer in the daily Press in the hope that the directors of the railway company may see it. The journalist re-echoes the hope because the reason "why all that is best in human nature is so often eliminated in the relations of shareholders, directors, and workers" is "that they don't know each other." In one sense the remark is certainly true. Shareholders often hold shares in industrial undertakings without even knowing where the work is being carried on or the conditions under which the workers labour. Even directors seldom know much of the details of the operations they are supposed to superintend, and have to rely upon their managers and foremen for both information and suggestions as to the carrying on and improvement of the business, showing the truth of the Socialists' contention that the capitalist class to-day perform no useful function in Society, and, so far from being "captains of industry," have to depend upon the working class for the actual direction and manipulation of the various processes of wealth production.

But the gist of the remark lies in the railway worker's simple faith that if the directors knew of the conditions under which he and his fellow wage slaves are so vilely sweated they would at once alter—if not abolish—those conditions. While this faith of the worker is largely due to ignorance, we could not dare to insult the journalist by crediting him with the same fault. Reports of Sweating, Children's Employment, Labour and other Royal Commissions of enquiry are at his command, or within his reach, as well as the works of Chas. Booth, Mr. Rowntree, R. Sherard, R. Hunter, etc., giving details of the conditions under which the workers exist and

obtain the means of existence. He must also be aware—even if the writer of the letter is not—that directors are put into position by shareholders for one purpose, that is, to extract or get extracted, as large an amount of surplus value out of their employees as possible. The shareholders are only concerned with obtaining the largest amount in dividends that they possibly can. The conditions under which, or the means whereby, this is obtained, concerns them not at all. They are just as willing to destroy life as to maintain it; just as willing to invest their money in gun or poison factories as in bakeries or butchers' shops; just as willing to supply the enemy with whom their country may be at war with money or munitions as they are to swindle their own governments in the matter of supplies; in fact, only let the business promise profit with any reasonable degree of probability, and no matter what it is, money will be forthcoming to secure that profit.

When the disclosures were being published of the conditions of the match makers in the East End of London—suffering from "phossy jaw" etc.—it was shown that a large number of the shareholders in Bryant & May's Match Co. (one of the worst offenders) were clergymen, and Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell give figures in their book "The Temperance Problem" showing the large number of clergymen holding shares in brewery companies.

Men, women, and children may drown in rotten ships sent to sea, or be murdered in mines that are known to be dangerous to life, for the sake of the profit accruing from the transactions.

Then why do they who are aware of these facts preach the absurd idea that it is only because the shareholders are unaware of the conditions under which their profit is made that such conditions are allowed to continue? Because they are employed for the purpose of perpetuating the ignorance of the working class by fostering all the simple, stupid, and erroneous ideas held by that class, and to mislead any who may be waking up to the fact that the capitalist class is concerned only with its own material interests, by encouraging the superstition that it is a question of "good" capitalists or "bad" capitalists, instead of it being the question of capitalism itself.

Interest, dividends and profits can only be procured by robbing the workers of the wealth they alone have produced. It therefore cannot be a question as to whether the robbery is carried out under "good" or "bad" conditions. The workers' only concern should be how to end the robbery. Tricky, therefore, as the attempt may be to foster the idea that it is largely a question of bringing the matters to the knowledge of the directors or shareholders, it can at best only have a temporary effect. The gigantic competition—generally ending in monopoly—of the present day increases the gulf between the capitalist class and the working class. This gulf is unbridgeable while private ownership in the means of life continues to exist.

With the increasing combination among capitalists there is an increasing economy in the production of wealth by the elimination of waste and useless labour, introduction of new and larger machinery and the increasing application of scientific discoveries to industry. This results in fewer workers being required to produce a given quantity of wealth, or a larger amount being produced by the same number in the same time as were employed before. The increase in the number of workers rendered relatively redundant by these means will bring home to the workers themselves the absurdity of imagining that the capitalist could—if he would—or would if he could—alter things in any material way while allowing the present basis to remain. Only by altering the system, by overthrowing and abolishing the capitalist class and establishing Socialism in its stead can the workers get rid of the bad conditions they exist under to-day.

J.F.

IMPORTANT! PLEASE NOTE—

The adjourned Meeting to discuss the Trade Union question will be held at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte St., Fitzroy Sq., on Saturday next, June 9th, at 6 p.m.

CONTINUED FROM MAY ISSUE.

The Extinction of Petty Enterprise.

By KARL KAUTSKY.

Translated from the German by H. J. NEUMANN and revised by the Author.

Since the beginning of the capitalist mode of production and until twenty years ago, the decline of the independent petty peasant enterprise has been most marked. The peasant was being reduced to the condition of a wage slave either through his holding becoming absorbed by a large farm or, where such did not exist in his immediate vicinity, through his holding being cut into pieces and sold to his neighbours. This development still continues to a large extent, although it has ceased in some localities owing principally to the aforesaid foreign competition, but partly also in consequence of the migration of agricultural labourers to the towns—a point we cannot deal with here. Statistics, for instance, show us the following results:—

FRANCE.		1882-1892.
SIZE OF FARM.		Increase (+) or Decrease (—)
Under 1 Hectare	...	+ 243,420 Hectares.
Over 1 and under 5 Hectares	...	— 108,434 ..
.. 5 .. 10 13,140 ..
.. 10 .. 40 532,243 ..
.. 40 Hectares 197,288 ..
GERMANY.		1882-1895.
Under 2 Hectares	...	— 17,494 Hectares.
Over 2 and under 5 Hectares	...	+ 95,781 ..
.. 5 .. 20	+ 563,477 ..
.. 20 .. 100 38,333 ..
.. 100 Hectares	...	+ 45,533 ..

(1 Hectare = 2.47 English acres.)

Everywhere, however, we find a decline in that agricultural enterprise which, having a separate existence, is independent of capital. The leasing system and mortgaging increase. In the German Empire, the mortgages on landed property increased in the ten years from 1886 to 1895 by about 23,000,000,000 Marks, and the number of farms held on lease rose from 2,322,899 in 1882 to 2,607,210 in 1895, viz., an increase of 284,311.

Finally, we find a decrease in the entire agricultural population. In the German Empire the number of persons employed in agriculture was 18,704,038 in 1882, while in 1895 the number was 17,815,187, or nearly a million less. Much more telling, however, than in agriculture is the decline of petty enterprise in industry. Here it is absolute.

INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN THE GERMAN EMPIRE.		1882.	1895.	Increase or Decrease
Size, according to No. of workers employed.	Number of Establishments.	Number of Establishments.		
Small (1 to 5 workers each)	2,175,857	1,989,572	— 8.6%.	
Medium (6 to 50 ..)	85,001	139,459	+ 64.1%.	
Large (over 50 ..)	9,481	17,941	+ 89.3%.	

Between 1882 and 1895 the population increased by 11.5%. The number of workers employed in small industrial establishments was in 1882 still over one half (59%) of the entire number of industrial workers (4,335,822 out of 7,340,789) but in 1895 the number fell to 46.5% (4,770,669 out of 10,239,269). During the same period, however, the number of workers employed in large industrial establishments was doubled (from 1,613,247 to 3,044,267).

As German capitalism is still young, these are most surprising figures, for the decline of petty industry is generally a tedious process.

An example will make this clear. Already in the forties of the eighteenth century, machine weaving, particularly the English weaving trade, produced such keen competition that the misery of the hand weavers became proverbial, and the starvation existing among them produced rebellion. Nevertheless, according to statistics, out of the 191,796 weavers in the German Empire in 1882, 285,144 were still employed in small weaving concerns (employing from 1 to 5 persons), that is to say, more than half. But nobody then maintained that there were good prospects in store for hand weaving,

and that its decline was not inevitable in the course of evolution. In England the last hand weaver has been starved long ago. In Germany, too, they are fast disappearing; there the number of persons employed in small weaving concerns decreased from 285,144 in 1882 to 156,242 in 1895. If there are still some hand weavers in existence, that does not prove that petty industry is capable of competing successfully, but merely that the hand weaver is capable of enduring starvation.

The complete disappearance of petty industry is not the first but the last act of the tragedy entitled "The Extinction of Petty Enterprise." The first effect of the competition with capitalist production is that the handicraftsman—and what may be said of him is with some modifications also applicable to the peasant—gradually sacrifices all that his own or his forefathers' industry succeeded in accumulating. The petty industrialist grows poor; in order to stave off his increasing poverty he resolves to be more industrious; the working hours are extended until late at night; wife and children are compelled to assist in the work; in place of expensive adult assistants cheaper apprentices are engaged, and their number disproportionately increased; and while the working hours are extended and the toil is proceeding with ever more feverish speed without rest or interval, food becomes more precarious, and the expenditure for housing and clothing is more and more cut down.

There is no more miserable, wretched existence than that of the petty industrialist or the small farmer who is struggling hard against overwhelming capital.

The assertion that the wage workers are to-day better off than the small farmer and the small manufacturer, or trader, is fully justified. This statement, however, was intended to show the workers that they had no reason to be discontented. But the arrow does not strike Socialism, at which it was directed, but private property. If indeed the propertyless are better off than the property-owning small manufacturers, of what value can their property be still to the latter? It ceases to be of advantage to them, it commences to be detrimental to them. If, for instance, the home weaver persists in carrying on his unprofitable concern, although he would be able to earn more in the factory, he does so only because he still possesses something, a cottage, a piece of land for growing vegetables, which he would have to surrender were he to give up his business. To the petty industrialist his possession of the means of production has ceased to be a safeguard against misery and has become a chain binding him hopelessly to utter wretchedness. In his case private property has brought about an effect which is not usually looked for. What a hundred years ago was still a blessing to the handicraftsman and peasant, has turned out a curse to him.

But it may be argued that with this increased misery the small peasant and handicraftsman are purchasing a higher independence and liberty than are enjoyed by the propertyless wage workers. Even such argument is erroneous. Where petty industry comes into contact with capital, it becomes only too rapidly quite dependent upon it. The handicraftsman becomes a home-industrialist and is thus enslaved by the capitalist; his home is turned into a branch of the factory; or he becomes an agent of the capitalist, a salesman of manufactured goods, besides bearing the cost of wear and tear; in both cases he is entirely dependent upon the capitalist. And the peasant who is unable to keep up the competition as small farmer or succumbs to the pressure of usury or taxes, also takes to home industry in the service of the capitalist or to wage work in the employ of the large farmer. He may become a journeyman or go to a factory or mine and leave the work of his little holding to be attended to by his

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST, June 1906.

SUNDAYS.		3rd.	10th.	17th.	24th.
Barking Broadway.	7.30	Carter & Gifford	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	Carter & Gifford
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30	F. S. Leigh	T. A. Jackson	J. Fitzgerald	E. Fairbrother
	7.30	J. Crump	E. Fairbrother	T. W. Allen	J. Kent
Bexley Heath, Broadway	7.0	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	R. Elrick	A. Anderson
Finbury Park	11.30	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson
	6.0	C. Lehané	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané
Forest Gate, Dames Road	7.45	J. Kent	Carter & Gifford	J. H. Kennett	P. C. Herbert
Forest Hill Station	11.30	J. Fitzgerald	H. Newman	Morrell & Killick	H. Newman
Fulham, Effie Road	7.0	W. A. Cole	J. Fitzgerald	P. C. Herbert	T. W. Allen
Highbury Corner	11.30	C. Lehané	J. Fitzgerald	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané
Jolly Butchers' Hill	11.30	F. E. Dawkins	R. H. Kent	J. Crump	F. E. Dawkins
	7.30	P. C. Herbert	J. Kent	Carter & Gifford	R. H. Kent
Manor Park Broadway	11.30	J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	Carter & Gifford	J. H. Kennett
Paddington, Prince of Wales	11.30	T. W. Allen	P. C. Herbert	F. S. Leigh	J. Fitzgerald
Plaistow, Cumberland Road	11.30	Carter & Gifford	J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	P. C. Herbert
Peckham Rye	6.0	T. W. Allen	Morrell & Killick	F. S. Leigh	T. A. Jackson
Tooting Broadway	7.0	J. Fitzgerald	F. S. Leigh	E. Fairbrother	J. Crump
Tottenham, West Green Rd.	11.30	P. C. Herbert	A. Anderson	R. H. Kent	J. Kent
	7.30	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald	F. S. Leigh
MONDAYS.		4th.	11th.	18th.	25th.
Ilford, Roden Street	8.30	J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	P. C. Herbert	J. Kent
WEDNESDAYS.		6th.	13th.	20th.	27th.
Highbury Corner	8.30	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané
Wimbledon Broadway	8.0	P. C. Herbert	E. Fairbrother	W. A. Cole	P. C. Herbert
THURSDAYS.		7th.	14th.	21st.	28th.
Tottenham, St. Ann's Rd.	8.0	A. Anderson	P. C. Herbert	A. Anderson	J. Kent
FRIDAYS.		8th.	15th.	22nd.	29th.
Hornsey, Middle Lane	8.30	J. Crump	R. H. Kent	A. Anderson	J. Crump
Upper Holloway, St. John's Pl.	8.30	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané
SATURDAYS.		2nd.	16th.	23rd.	30th.
East Ham, opposite 'Ruskin'	8.0	A. Anderson	J. H. Kennett	Carter & Gifford	A. Anderson

wife and young children. Where then is his independence and freedom? His property alone distinguishes him from the proletarian, or wage slave, but it is that very property which prevents him from taking advantage of the best opportunities to obtain work; it ties him to a certain spot and makes him more dependent than the propertyless wage worker. The private ownership of the means of production increases not only the material misery but also the dependence of the small man. In this respect private property has also produced a contrary effect: it has changed from a bulwark of freedom to the means of enslavement.

But, it will be urged, private property ensures to the handicraftsman and peasant at any rate the ownership of the product of their labour. Now, this is poor consolation, seeing that the value of these products has declined to such an extent that it does not suffice for the sustenance of the producer and his family. But even this poor consolation is a delusion. In the first instance, it does not apply to the large army of persons who are compelled to take to home work or wage slavery in order to support themselves. Neither does it apply to the majority of the small handicraftsmen and peasants whom overwhelming capital has not yet brought into its direct service, so that until now they have apparently been fortunate enough to preserve their entire independence. It does not apply to all those who are in debt—the usurer holding a mortgage on a peasant farm has a claim superior to that of the peasant himself, to the product of the peasant's labour. First of all the usurer has to be paid, and only what remains belongs to the peasant: whether this balance suffices to maintain the peasant and his family is no concern of the usurer's. The peasant and the handicraftsman both work as much for the capitalist as the wage worker does. The difference which private property causes in this respect between propertyless and property-owning workers, is only that the wages of the former is generally regulated according to customary requirements, while as far as the property-owning workers are concerned, no such limit exists. In the case of the latter it may happen that after paying the usurer's interest nothing remains of the product of their labour—that they work for nothing, owing to private property.

If in remote places there are still peasants and handicraftsmen to be found who are not in debt, even they are compelled to pay their tribute to capital by means of the National Debt. By interest on mortgages and goods on credit, peasants and handicraftsmen pay interest on capital they themselves have employed. By taxes raised for paying interest on the National Debt, they pay interest on capital which the

State has borrowed in order to enrich at their expense their very competitors and exploiters—contractors, builders, large manufacturers, great landowners, and others. Militarism and the National Debt, these are the two means by which the State of to-day succeeds in forcing even the remotest village into the domain of capitalist exploitation, thereby hastening the abolition of peasantry and handicraft.

What is the final result of this painful struggle against the overwhelming competition of industry on a large scale? What reward is there for the handicraftsman or peasant for his "thrift" and his "industry," that is to say for the enslavement of himself, his wife and children, for their physical and mental ruin? The reward for that is bankruptcy, entire disinheritation (expropriation is the artistic term for it), divorce from the means of production, descent into the proletariat.

That is the inevitable final result of the economic development in Society to-day, a result as inevitable as death itself, and just as death comes as a relief to the person suffering from a painful disease, so under present conditions is bankruptcy hailed with equal satisfaction by the small man as a relief from property which has become a heavy burden to him. The continued existence of petty industry leads indeed to such demoralisation and misery that we must ask ourselves the question whether we would be justified in delaying its extinction, if that were at all possible. Would it be more desirable that handicraftsmen and peasants should all sink to the position of the hand weavers of the Ore Mountains or that they should become wage workers in great industrial concerns?

This alone is to be considered when efforts are made to maintain petty enterprise, for it is impossible in this age of steam and electricity to place handicraft and small farming in a flourishing condition so that they may bring to the petty proprietor a share in modern culture. The self-supporting small concern, independent of capital, having perfect control of its means of production and of its products—this system of property holding and wealth producing, upon which in the middle ages and even so late as the seventeenth century all economic existence was based, disappears inevitably before expanding capitalism, which seizes one trade after another. What still survives in the shape of petty industry and at times even newly develops, is nothing but a hidden form of wage slavery, and by no means one of its highest forms. It becomes the last refuge of those unfortunate propertyless persons who cannot find employment in large industrial concerns and who are too proud to beg, too honest to steal.

[CONCLUDED.]

Printed by Jacobson Bros., Ltd., 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

BEXLEY & DISTRICT—R. A. V. Morris, Sec., Oxshott, Warren Rd., Bexley Heath. Branch meets Wednesdays at Sec's House at 8. Public Meetings, Market Place, Bexley Heath, Sundays at 8.

CENTRAL—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST HAM—A. E. Jaromb, Sec., 85, Forest Lane, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON—Sidney Auty, Secretary, 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Sundays at 8.30.

FULHAM—E. Fairbrother, Secretary, 15, Musgrove Crescent, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON—Communications to the Secretary, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Mondays at 9 p.m.

PADDINGTON—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at the Branch Rooms, 29, The Parade, Tooting, which are open to members and friends every evening.

TOTTENHAM—H. A. Young, Secretary, 46, Rosebery Gardens, Green Lanes, Harringay, N. Branch meets Mondays 8 p.m., at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road.

WATFORD—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Sq., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following:
BIRMINGHAM—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.
BRADFORD (Yorks)—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.
BURTON-ON-TRENT—J. Blundell, 157, New St.
LIVERPOOL—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA—Laura Rogers, 15, Wallis Avenue.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.
CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.
SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.
POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.
SOCIALIST STANDARD (Vol. I. Bound) 3s. 6d.
 Unbound Copies 1 to 12 ... 1s. 6d.
 Do. do. 13 to 21 ... 9d.
MANIFESTO AND RULES of the S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.
WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.
JONES' BOY ... 1½d.
SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.
HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1½d.
THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 6½d.

ALL POST FREE.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 23. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, JULY, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

That the Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND TRADE UNIONISM.

The first day's Session of the Party meeting on Trade Unionism was held on Saturday, May 12, at 6 p.m. at the Communist Club, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square.

Comrade A. J. M. Gray, was elected to the Chair.

It was decided to discuss resolutions to be placed before the meeting in the order in which they appeared on the printed paper supplied to the members.

J. Kent accordingly moved the following resolution:—

"Whereas The Socialist Commonwealth will be established by the conscious act of the revolutionary working class wresting from the master class the ownership and control of the means of wealth production, for which conscious act the working class must prepare by organising industrially and politically, and, whereas existing working class industrial organisations, being based upon the superstition of the brotherhood of capital and labor, and representing only sectional interests, are stumbling blocks in the revolutionary path, the S.P.G.B. while re-affirming that 'The first duty of the Socialist Party is the teaching of its principles and the organisation of a political party on a Socialist basis,'

"(1.) Declares war on existing Trade Unions and their leaders.

"(2.) Urges its members, while not neglecting their 'first duty,' to advocate the formation of an industrial organisation based upon the irreconcilable antagonism between the capitalist class and the working class, and having as its object the taking over and administering of the means of wealth production: such industrial organisation to be affiliated to or working in complete unison with The Socialist Party, thus ensuring that the class struggle shall be waged as effectively as possible on both the industrial and political fields."

In moving his resolution, J. Kent said that if the trade unions were stumbling blocks in the revolutionary path, those stumbling blocks had to be removed. He thought that recognising the necessity for political action, the Party should affirm its decision to organise a political party on a Socialist basis. The Party, however, had never laid it down that we should carry on war on the existing trade unions, but had merely opposed the trade union leaders through its press and through its propaganda. The economic organisation should either be affiliated to the political party, or should work in unison with it, or otherwise, it would be as well to abandon political action and simply carry on an economic fight. It would be absolutely necessary for the action of the one on the political field to be supported by the action of the other on the economic field, and the action of the one on the economic field to be supported by the action of the other on the political.

Phillips seconded the resolution.

A. Anderson moved to amend the resolution by inserting "Socialist" before "industrial organisation" in lines 3 and 7 of clause (2), which was accepted by the mover and seconder, and to substitute "and controlled by" for "or work-

ing in complete unison with" in lines 8 and 9.

Anderson said he agreed with Kautsky that the political organisation must dominate the economic. The political must control the economic or the contrary would occur. He did not want to see repeated the farce of the S.L.P. in America and the S.T. and L.A., or the tragedy of the S.L.P. in England and the I.W.W.

Dix seconded the amendment. Barker asked whether it would be possible for men and women to join the political organisation and not belong to the economic and vice-versa.

Anderson replied that in joining the S.P.G.B. members of the working class would join it in both its political and economic aspects. They would pay subscriptions to THE organisation—that organisation comprising both wings.

F. S. Leigh asked whether, in the event of a union being formed, a workman refusing to join the political party would be compelled to become a blackleg.

Anderson: If he did not adhere to the principles of the party he would not be fit to join it.

T. A. Jackson said he had always understood that we had to capture political power and then to proceed to the administration of the means and instruments of production. The difficult point was that while present Society existed the wage-workers would be compelled to join permanent or temporary trade unions. Trade unions were a necessity under capitalism.

With regard to the leaders of the trade unions, a trade union leader was what the rank and file allowed him to be. A trade union was the arm which the worker instinctively raised to protect himself. As Marx said in his "Value, Price and Profit," "if the workers did not struggle to maintain the price of their commodity they would rapidly become degenerated into slaves incapable of revolt." If the resolution was carried the only logical course open to the Party would be to withdraw all its members from the existing trade unions. What it was necessary to wage war on was the economic ignorance which rendered these trade unions ineffective.

It was our purpose to wage war upon their faults and the source of their faults—their economic ignorance. It was necessary that the political party should dominate the economic. When the workers had been educated by the political party they themselves would see to it that their trade unions were no longer ineffective.

Neumann said he was opposed to Kent's resolution. When war was declared on the unions war would be declared on the leaders. But he did not agree that the declaration of war on existing trade unions was an anti-trade union declaration. There was no reason that these existing trade unions should not be Socialist trade unions. If war was declared on the unions, however, it would be impossible for the members of the S.P.G.B. to remain inside the existing trade unions. This attitude was impracticable at the present time, because it was a question of their daily bread that members of the Party should be members

of the trade unions. He would not support the resolution because it was unsound.

Cole asked had Jackson ever been in a strike or conducted one. The trade unions were not organised to fight the capitalist class, but to protect the capitalist system and support it. He supported Kent's resolution.

Fitzgerald said that the S.P.G.B. was the first party which had at its inception held meetings on the trade union question. If we declared war on the existing trade unions we should be waging war upon them in every shape and form. Certain members of the Party had to remain in trade unions. The question was how could war be best waged on the wrong basis on which the trade unions were organised. If men were engaged in a works at 30 a week, and 5 per week reduction was threatened, they would naturally come out to resist that reduction, then what would be our position? At present we could do no more than propagate the right idea inside and outside the trade unions in favour of the proper method of organisation. He was opposed to the resolution.

Fairbrother said that if men were on strike our position was to support them, yet all the time to point out how they were wrongly organised. The unions should be based on the class struggle. The economic organisation was more important than the political. The political was but the reflex of the economic. The L.R.C., for instance, had got their position on the back of the existing trade unions, not by any fight on the political field. If the workers were organised on the class struggle on the economic field he could not conceive their action on the political field being anything but that of Socialists. The majority of the working class were outside the trade unions, and the trade unions could not permanently improve their conditions as long as the condition of the unorganised mass outside was not improved.

A. W. Pearson asked whether Fairbrother wanted the Party members to be allowed to join an economic organisation not affiliated to the Party. If members and non-members of our Party were to be admitted to an economic organisation they too would soon find themselves in the House of Commons as political mountebanks. The union advocated by Fairbrother would allow members of other parties to come into it and so dominate it on the political field. If the Party was to form an industrial union it must be formed to act in unison with the Party. Barker wanted to know what was to be done with members of the Party inside the existing trade unions in view of the proposed war on the unions. He was opposed to the position laid down by the resolution.

T. W. Allen said he proposed a revolutionary economic organisation which would soon know how to deal with those who wanted to "wangle" who came into that organisation. The organisation should not be affiliated to the political party until the class consciousness of the workers would bring about unity on the political field. That the working class were ignorant was the effect of certain causes. The labour leaders wilfully betrayed the interests of the workers to the capitalist class. The present trade unions were based upon the idea of the finality of the capitalist system. Under the present unions one section of the workers went into the fight with the capitalist class whilst another section blacklegged upon them. When a sturdy, sound, economic, revolutionary organisation had been formed, then the political would come as the reflex of the economic.

A. Anderson replied that the trade unions were shams and frauds and delusions. Just as long as you had a separate organisation from the political party the movement would be side-tracked whether it was called the I.W.W. or any other combination of initials. Since the trade unions were stumbling blocks in the revolutionary path, they must be fought. It did not follow that if it was decided to oppose the unions that the members of the S.P.G.B. should be immediately called out of the existing trade unions. As the political party controlled the members of the political party so also would they control the members of the economic organisation.

J. Kent replied that the resolution urged that the members should advocate an economic organisation, not immediately proceed to organise it. The time had arrived when we should go

beyond the words of the manifesto, and advocate the formation of a Socialist industrial organisation. The trades unions, as Marx said, failed because of the guerilla warfare they were carrying on. Had we not said in the columns of the Party paper that the proper organisation of the working class was their organisation as a class. Further, no organisation would be effective that was not affiliated with or working in complete unison with the political party. If you were going to form an organisation apart from the political party, then in that way lay danger.

The amendment having thus become a substantive resolution, the vote was taken and the resolution was carried by 30 votes to 26.

(To be continued.)

THE NEW MRS. CAUDLE.

THE Right Honourable the Member for Battersea still pursues the tenor of his strenuous way and may with some degree of confidence be expected to attain to the ideal which he seems to have set before him, of going down to posterity as the possessor of lecturing talents, not less efficient than those which the notorious Mrs. Caudle exercised with such effect upon her unfortunate spouse. And, indeed, the resemblance between the celebrated lady mentioned and our "Honest John" rests upon more than that idiocentric volubility which has impelled both characters to erupt into torrential verbosity with little or no provocation. The substance of their disquisitions is almost identical—the same relentless logic, the same elegance of diction, the same charm of style, the same irrepressible argumentativeness, the same measure of applicability of their observations to the subject addressed. If Mrs. Caudle were alive to-day, she would be jealous indeed of her reputation now challenged so persistently by her great male prototype. It is true she might argue with justice that Mr. Burns is afforded facilities she never had. She lived in the ante-women's suffrage days and probably was never able to get even so close to the sounding-board of the Empire as the ladies' gallery of the House of Commons, whereas John has his feet on the floor of the House right beneath the sounding board itself. But, then, John could retort that he started heavily handicapped, in as much as he could not commence in the nature of things as an old woman. But, however that may be, John is making palpable progress which his elevation to the proud dignity of heavily fed jackal to the Liberal Capitalist Party has only served to fillip. He is simply insatiable, rushing to every point of the compass in order, cuckoo-like, to find another nest in which to deposit his curtain-lecture egg. He makes surprise visits to workhouses and turns off upon the pauper inmates his famous exhortation to abstemious living and thrift. He attends temperance meetings to emphasise the folly of working men wasting their substance (which they have not got) upon four-ale and other delectable draughts. He sternly lectures the "Labour" members of the House of Commons, whose one concern is to conform to the rules of that august assembly, upon the enormity of any departure from orthodox Parliamentary procedure, and lays it down with crushing vocal inflection to the same men obsessed by the necessity for the establishment of an unquestioned reputation for respectability, that proper deportment is a personal condition to be striven for single-mindedly. He lectures tariff reformers upon the stupidity of quoting, without examination, figures relating to pauperism, and corrects their information with more figures which he has had supplied to him, and which he has never examined. He lectures women demonstrators upon their lack of self-control, and is seized with an uncontrollable desire to slap them—but dare not. He attends the distribution of prizes at a girls' gymnastic school, and lectures the unfortunate pupils upon the urgency of a knowledge of washing and ironing. And so on. And so on. Always carrying about fully caparisoned with bundles of lectures and packets of gratuitous advice for persons who,

generally speaking, are better qualified to give him instruction, and who certainly have little or nothing to learn from him. Overweening, bumptious and arrogant he always was, as those who knew him intimately in the days that are past, were aware. To these undesirable qualities are added to-day a cringing servility before his paymasters and a passion for giving unsolicited advice to all and sundry, often absurdly inapplicable to the moment; when that is not so, coming with little decency from an individual of Burns' record. A sense of humour, which he seems to entirely lack, would save him from many a ludicrous situation; a little less superficial knowledge would enable him to pose with a little more reason and a little more success in that character of Tribune of the People which he so loves to affect. And if to both were added a little more courtesy, a little more discrimination, and it were possible to subtract something of the pimp and the bully, he might conceivably become a fairly tolerable person. As it is, we fear that he is altogether intolerable, that his advice is an impertinence and his lectures an infliction, and we take solace from the knowledge that, unlike the unfortunate Mr. Caudle, who was apparently quite unable to rid himself of the incubus of his bedmate and her lectures, he will surely awake one day to find himself discovered as the vainglorious pedagogue he is, and cast off by those upon whose ignorance he relies for his success as champion curtain-lecturer. The day that witnesses the consummation of that desirable act will witness also his fall from his present high estate; for the one thing that is quite certain is that it is only by virtue of his ability to gull and hector the working class that the capitalist Liberal Party consent to fee him so liberally and invest him with a little brief authority.

We trust John Burns may find sufficient grace to persevere in chastened mood these few plain words. We trust too, they may have the effect of causing him to reconsider himself.

However that may be, it will surely not be hurtful to him if he will desist for a few moments from trying to force his opinions upon others as though they were things of value and hearken with what respect he may to the opinion that some of the others desire for his own good to offer him.

ALEGRA.

PARTY NOTES.

THE Quarterly Delegate Meeting will be held at the Communist Club on Saturday, July 28th, at 6.30 p.m. The Quarterly Report and Financial Statement will be sent to branches immediately the Branch Return Sheets are all received at Head Office, to enable the Report to be completed.

The Islington branch deserve a few words mention of their splendid literature sales during the quarter. Of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD they have taken 156 copies of April issue, 377 copies of May and 533 copies of June, making a grand total of 1,066. During the same period they have taken 650 copies of the S.P.G.B. Manifesto.

Of course, we know that all branches cannot go and do likewise, but the sales by other branches clearly prove that nearly all are doing better this season than last.

The E.C. have been in communication with Mr. H. J. Wishart, of Woolwich I.L.P., who has publicly expressed his desire to debate the policy of the S.P.G.B. Full particulars will be announced later.

By the Lecture List it will be seen that meetings have been restarted at Watford. The action of the police will be awaited with some interest.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary or from the Central Offices of the Party, 28, Cursitor Street, E.C.

A WORKINGMAN'S EDUCATION.

IT is difficult to see what connection the present "Education" Bill or the outcry regarding it has with education itself. Indeed, the frothy struggle for religious domination almost completely obscures the really important matter beneath.

Most people do not distinguish between education proper, and the mere imparting of information, but the distinction is vital. To educate is not to merely pack the brain with facts or cut and dried formulae, but is to bring out the powers of the mind, to train the faculties for the reception and use of life's present experience and of the knowledge handed down from the past; to prepare the mind for the first-hand gathering of knowledge, and the co-ordination and right use of it.

To pith children's minds with facts and dead formulae whose inner significance is not understood, may make excellent parrots, but cannot make thinkers. Such a procedure causes a one-sided, mechanical development, and leads to a taste for snipetty bits. It does not enable the mind to draw useful knowledge from the facts of life; it brings about an incapacity for sustained and logical thinking, and creates a habit of mind that is eagerly receptive of superficials, but in no wise creative.

More surface information, however well tabulated, cannot take the place of, and is a poor preparation for, the first-hand experience of life. Our personal experience is the foundation of our appreciation of the great works of the world, and our early information has to be recast in the mould of our later experience.

It cannot be denied that the so-called education of to-day resembles more a packing of the brain than an unfolding of its capabilities, and this defect is but the reflex of the mechanical, specialised and hurried character of modern society.

It is, of course, with the "education" of the working class that we are most concerned, although the defects of this are reflected to a great degree in the education of the class above. Naturally, also, we find that the quality of the worker's instruction is traceable to the demands of the prevailing methods of wealth production. There is no necessity to the capitalist of a mass of fully-educated, original-minded and high-spirited men as wage-slaves; they would be in the way, and far too costly. The necessities of the day demand workers who are mechanical, one-sidedly developed, and eminently submissive. It is necessary to the capitalist, not only that the workers be not taught things which may injure his domination, but also that their energies (and his wealth) be not used unproductively for him; that they be trained so far and no farther; that they be disciplined in routine work, and pithed with just sufficient knowledge to do the master's work cheaply and fairly efficiently.

Our system of education has, in general, the appearance of being deliberately planned to a sinister end, so well does it suit the master's interests. A few who may be required as hired captains of industry, instructors and such walks of life (and the few only), can be sifted from out the mass of the people by means of a sieve of "Higher Education" (save the mark!) which contains a special hole here and there labelled "Scholarship," through which a fixed and very small number of the more able or more fortunate may pass; but for the mass there is nothing but the compulsion, under threat of hunger, to go out to earn their bread as soon as they have passed the point, no more no less, at which their masters say they are fit for the factory.

The history of "education" in this country is a curious mixture of cupidity and hypocrisy, being largely the story of the struggle for religious domination. The modern system is the direct descendant of that which was born of rival religious struggles for power, with the various religious bodies competing viciously for a larger number of children into whom to force their dogmas; and on the poor children was inflicted the proverbial pound of flesh to the ounce of useful knowledge.

To-day the squabble in the capitalist camp is almost entirely over religious instruction, the question of education itself taking a quite

insignificant part in the controversy. The length and breadth of the land is stumped in the interests of rival religious factions, (representing as they do, the interests of various sections of the master class,) anxious to inculcate the dogma of their sect and interest into a larger number of the nation's young.

In this question the workers, (who seldom, if ever, go to church) have had impressed upon them the views of sections of the ruling class by means of the newspaper and platform, and have been stirred into a flabby semblance of interest in a question of dogma which, in reality, does not concern them at all.

What does concern them is the fact that they and their children are members of a subject class deprived of light and life by a system of class-domination out-worn.

What does concern them to know is that the associated industry of to-day places it within their power to become masters of their own destiny, and to themselves enjoy the wealth their labour creates, and so prevent the consumption of hard-earned bread by the wilfully idle mouths of others.

What does also concern them is the fact that an education, worthy the name, is a possibility for them only when they have conquered the power of the State, abolished class parasitism, and organized industry, in order that the wealth, health and leisure that form the indispensable foundation for education and happy life may be theirs.

F. C. W.

S.D.F. APOLOGIST and S.P.G.B. CRITIC.

SPEAKING at Watford on June 24th last Mr. A. S. Albery, of the S.D.F., a one-time member (for a few months) of this Party, in answering questions put to him from the audience, stated

(1) That he was not a consenting party to the appearance of his name on the manifesto issued by most of the active London members of the S.D.F. prior to their withdrawal from that body (because it had ceased to be the political party of the working class) to found The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

(2) That he protested against the use of his name in that connection and that a Party must be corrupt that would use names in such a way without authority.

(3) That he was no sectarian Socialist and did not therefore withdraw from the I.L.P., of which he was a member, during the period of his association with The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

(4) That he was a Marxian Socialist.

(5) That the S.P.G.B. did not seem to understand what Marxian Socialism was.

(6) That it was true that members of the S.D.F. were members also of the National Liberal Club, but only for social purposes. Membership of that club had no political significance.

We take the trouble to deal with these statements because Mr. Albery is a fairly prominent member of the S.D.F. whose methods we attack and may be accepted as representing the views of that organisation upon the questions raised. Also because Mr. Albery's brief association with the S.P.G.B. may incline some to the view that he has special knowledge of this Party's position and has expressed that knowledge in the statements recorded above. Further, because we welcome any criticism of our position and are glad of any opportunity to reply to it and remove any misapprehension that may exist, our desire being to discuss plainly and properly all matters of working-class concern and vindicate the correctness of our attitude thereupon or acknowledge our error.

Our replies to these assertions therefore are, (1 and 2) that the individuals who drew up the first manifesto containing an indictment of the S.D.F. position and a justification of the attitude of the protesting members, included A. S. Albery, who framed part of it himself; that he was present at the several meetings, held at his own house, at which the manifesto was discussed in detail and finally approved of; that Albery was a member of the Provisional Committee which arranged the matters preliminary to the formation of this Party; that as a member of that Committee his name appears upon a second

manifesto issued prior to the establishment of the Party, a document which confirmed the first manifesto in every particular and added considerable additional evidence for the conclusion that the S.D.F. was politically corrupt. This second document also called the meeting at which the Party was inaugurated. Albery was present at this inaugural meeting. He said no word of opposition to the formation of the Party, nor of protest against any unfair use of his name. He accepted nomination for membership to the first Executive Committee and was elected. He approved the Declaration of Principles, which all members must sign, and *we have his signed form in our possession*. As a member of the E.C. he endorsed the attitude of the Party, and undertook the administration of the Party policy and the application of the Party rules. He never questioned, because he could not then and cannot now, the accuracy of any statement appearing in the two manifestoes (which, as we have said, he was part author of), nor can we find any record or recollection of any protest of the sort now entered.

If in the face of all this Albery asserts that he did not acquiesce in the publication of the document referred to, he either deliberately fabricates or is the victim of a woeful mental aberration. If it was not issued with his full knowledge and approval, he has to explain his large participation in the subsequent development of that document. If, on the other hand, the recital of particulars contained in the foregoing enables him to remember sufficient to justify the withdrawal of the statement now made, he has to explain when the S.D.F. ceased to be the corrupt organisation he asserted with good evidence it was, two years ago. So much for numbers 1 and 2.

(3) The Declaration of Principles (see page 1 of this paper) signed by Albery pledges opposition to all other political parties. If, therefore, he was a member of the I.L.P., which he was pledged to fight as a member of the S.P.G.B., Albery is correct when he says he is not a sectarian Socialist—he is merely a fraud.

(4) Actions speak louder than words. The acts of Marxian Socialists express consistent and unwavering antagonism to Capitalism and the capitalist class. The acts of the S.D.F. which Albery claims membership of, do nothing of the kind on Albery's own shewing in the second manifesto previously referred to. Albery, therefore, either does not know what Marxian Socialism is or asserts what he knows to be untrue.

(5) This statement certainly lacks the only thing that can give it weight—evidence. Albery was challenged to produce his and could not.

(6) The subscriptions of members to the National Liberal Club are used for Party purposes. The Club is the Head Quarters of Capitalist Liberalism and its sycophants. It is directly concerned with the organization of the Liberal vote and the direction of the Liberal forces. Its act in donating £100 to John Burns wages fund in the old days was clock-full of political significance. Every member who joins it is a supporter of the Liberal Party if only to the extent of his subscription.

That is our answer to Mr. Albery's allegations. In defence of his present unfortunate, not to say ludicrous, position as a member of a Party whose actions on his own shewing will not bear analysis, he may be making the same or similar charges and assertions in other places. We shall always be glad to deal with any such directly they reach us. Misrepresentation and inaccuracy are exceedingly difficult to overtake and we prefer to give them as short a start as possible. We are, therefore, obliged to our Watford Comrade for his prompt action.

We only need add that if Mr. Albery has any point which may constitute a grievance with him or a charge against us, we shall be happy to hear from him.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

MY RIGHT TO WORK: FREE TRADE, PROTECTION OR SOCIALISM? by R. B. Sutherland, Clarendon Press, 72, Fleet Street, E.C. Paper 6d., Cloth 1s.

THE ETHICS OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT, by H. S. Salt, Humanitarian League, 53, Chancery Lane. One Penny.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed, —The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Curator St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,



SATURDAY, JULY 7, 1906.

THE FOOD OF THE PEOPLE.

LET the people eat grass, said the representative of the governing class in reply to the clamour of a hungry populace in the days that preceded the French Revolution; and let the people eat the poisonous products of Packingtown say that portion of the capitalist governing class of to-day engaged in drawing their profits from that nauseating undertaking. And from the point of view of capitalism, why not? If diseased flesh, decaying offal, and excrementitious matter can be dosed with essences to change its taste and chemicals to stay the process of decomposition and after passing through embalming machinery appear upon epicurean tables as ham, chicken and tongue, or other delectable comestible, and upon the scanty board of the hungry as corned beef or what not; and if this can be done without inducing nausea in those who eat and without coroners' verdicts of death from ptomaine or other poisoning being too closely associated with the "food" stuff; and if, above all, it can be done at a good fat profit—why not, indeed? Why cant of the "moral" aspect and blather of the anti-Social rapacity of the vendors of such filth? Are they more anti-social or immoral than the God-fearing capitalist who locks out his men for refusing to submit to his terms, or shuts down his factory or mine when, through the arduous toil of his "hands" a surplus has accumulated which he can then proceed to work off at enhanced prices? He doesn't care greatly whether the men thrown out of employment starve to death. It isn't expected of him. He is quite within his right in the action he takes. "The law allows it, the court awards it." If the unemployed refuse to die quietly, he is quite justified in shooting them into eternity. He is even applauded for his "strong" action in protecting property and maintaining order. The embalmer of "beef," or filth, as the case may be—or rather the capitalist director of that "industry"—is just as indifferent to the fate of the purchaser as his kind ordering fellow capitalist is to the fate of his discharged hand. Yet a mighty roar of indignation goes up when we get a sensational disclosure of the "food" embalmer's method and the name of Armour is anathema; while the only roar that goes up at the Featherstone disclosures is

one of congratulation and the name of Masham is honoured in the land.

CAPITALIST CANT.

THE only apparent reason for this divergence of opinion is that the probable purchasers of "canned delicacies" are to some extent members of the capitalist class themselves and their *esprit de corps* is not equal to the strain of a possible painful death even in the noble cause of unlimited profits. It is fairly certain that if it had been merely a question of the revolting conditions under which the workers of Packingtown were forced to exist, the stir would have been barely sufficient to perceptibly disturb the social placidity. That at any rate has been the invariable effect of other disclosures of working-class hardships and unhappiness in the process of production. They can be poisoned by lead or pork, killed by starvation or bullets, cremated, suffocated or drowned in mines, worked under revolting conditions in Chicago or Cradley or Whitechapel or the Potteries. That is of no great consequence. But let the suspicion get abroad that the capitalist goes in danger of his life from poisoned food out of Chicago or of disease-infested clothing out of Whitechapel and the Social "conscience" is immediately aroused, the "soul" of Society is stirred to its deepest depths, and we are in the throes of a great popular agitation assiduously fostered by Press and Pulpit, for something to be done to end such inhuman rapacity.

The Chicago disclosures simply go to show that adulteration is still regarded by the capitalist class as it was by that "Christ-like" political pet of Nonconformity and Liberalism, John Bright, as a legitimate form of competition. The keener the competition the greater the adulteration. And when competition finds its inevitable end in monopoly what more natural than that the methods which have accompanied its evolution should remain to assist in the creation of greater profits. "Morality" has nothing to do with it. The question of profits is the only thing that matters to capitalism—that and a tender regard for longevity. While commodities are produced for profit there will always be adulteration and unemployment and sweating and misery and poverty. They all spring from the same source in the private ownership of the means of living and although it may occur that some of the more revolting and dangerous manifestations of that private ownership may be suppressed, they cannot be disposed of until the cause has been attacked and removed. Until then the people are at the mercy of the capitalist profit-monger in the matter of their food-stuffs as in all else.

THE MACDONALD-BRUNNER COMBINATION.

THE position of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald as backer of Sir John Brunner's bill, designed to reduce the age limit at which children may be withdrawn from school, seems to have created quite a mild sensation among those who, for some reason we do not pretend to understand, regard Mr. Macdonald as a leader of the working class and one whose departure from what they regard as the straight path, is a notable and highly deplorable event. Thus Mr. Rose, one of the regular contributors to the *Clarion*, writing in that paper, asks for explanations of "a callous and capitalistic attempt to lower" the age limit. He thinks that as chairman of the I.L.P., Secretary of the L.R.C., and whip of the Parliamentary "Labour" group, Mr. Macdonald's association with a whiggish millionaire in the production of a bill which would "accentuate the worst evils of child labour," a bill particularly "Anti-Socialistic and retrograde" is exceedingly lamentable. "Macdonald's splendid work for the movement has entitled him to such a measure of gratitude and admiration that it pains one to say a single word of disparagement, but his best friends can hardly defend an attitude of approval toward an attempt to sentence children of twelve to the drudgery of farm labour," etc.

Well, we do not wish to speak disparagingly of Mr. Macdonald either, but really we are at some

loss to know why his present action of support of a capitalist measure should give rise to any agitation. We thought it was fairly well understood by every student of current politics that Mr. Macdonald's splendid work for "the movement" was always subservient to his splendid work for Mr. Macdonald. That was the reason why we were quite astounded when reading of him in a contemporary as the "dark-eyed inscrutable Secretary of the L.R.C." Not because he hasn't dark eyes, but because he was always to us so far removed from the inscrutable. We saw in him a gentleman whose action was most consistently pro-Macdonald. If "the movement's" interests conflicted with the interests of Macdonald, so far as we have been able to observe, it has always been so much the worse for "the movement."

THE VALUE OF "INDEPENDENCE."

"He's a good Socialist" said Mr. Clarion Vanner Hartley of an I.L.P. colleague who succeeded in winning a seat at the General Election.—"He's a good Socialist only he believes in getting in." He might have said the same thing of Mr. Macdonald. He was a good "independent Labour" candidate, a very "independent Labour" candidate, only—"he believed in getting in." He believed, like Mr. Ward, the "Labour" member for Stoke, in "getting his feet into the House of Commons and he wasn't very particular how he did it." We pointed out at the time how very fragile was Mr. Macdonald's "independence" as compared with his desire to "get in." We understood that his real business was to "get on" and as "getting in" was so good a means to that end why of course he must get in. And, therefore, it was not astonishing to us that he got in, this "independent Labour" gentleman, by collaboration with the Liberal Candidate and by arrangement with the local Liberal Association. It was, briefly, because of this arrangement that no "Labour" candidate was put forward at the recent by-election at Leicester (Mr. Macdonald's constituency). It would have disturbed the harmony existing between Liberalism and "Labour" and imperilled the Parliamentary security of the Macdonald. And so it came about that, although Mr. Broadbent, the retiring member, was by way of being a "Labour" leader himself and the seat might, therefore, be fairly held to be a "Labour" possession by the L.R.C.-cum-I.L.P. type of "Labour" mind, no opposition was offered to the candidature of a very hack Liberal with strongly marked anti-labour tendencies. Mr. Macdonald was, of course, a strong opponent of Liberalism, a professor of Socialism and a believer in independence, but—he believes in "getting in." And if his getting in and stopping there conflicts with his Socialism and his independence and his anti-Liberal professions, so much the worse as we have said, for them. The "army must not be disturbed"—that so readily perceived harmony between conflicting interests!

Since he has been in Parliament Mr. Macdonald has always seemed devoted to the same end, and his present support of the Brunner bill is only one of the many manifestations of his desire to ingratiate himself with Capitalist Liberalism—and preserve the harmony. Besides which, as consistency seems to be something of a passion with him (a consistency of wrong truly, but still a consistency) it was in accord with precedent that he should be in favour of child labour. Did he not support David Shackleton, the champion of the half-time child labour system, for the premier position in the "Labour" group against Keir Hardie? Let Mr. Rose and the others who seem so much perturbed, cease then from troubling and be at rest. Mr. Macdonald is of the stuff that "Labour" statesmen are made of, and however grievous it may seem to Mr. Rose and Co., he will assuredly (it requires no gift of prophecy to say so) snap at the first portfolio any Liberal administration may have to offer him.

THE POSITION OF THE "LABOUR" GROUP.

As to demanding explanation of the "Labour" group—really, Mr. Rose ought to know better.

The "Labour" group have nothing to explain. The "Labour" group is not one and indivisible, on the contrary it is, to be precise, twenty-nine entirely divisible! Its members may do just whatever seemeth them fit and do it. They have no common principle to build upon and no common idea of the edifice to be erected. For which reason they can have no common programme—and plume themselves upon the fact. They are, in short, a heterogeneous collection of (upon most questions) mutually warring elements in momentary danger of sliding off the one plank (the re-establishment of the *status quo ante* Farwell) upon which they perch precariously, and dissolving into two or three or more sections. Only the liberty to do as they generally please and the fear that in their present condition they would probably hang separately if they did not hang together, keeps them in what is called a group. Mr. Rose knows—or should know—this quite well and his appeal to the group to keep Mr. Macdonald in order is, therefore, either an obscure form of humour, or a lumbering attempt at bluff.

The matter is one that well illustrates the utterly futile position the "Labour" members are in. It is a further demonstration that if the working class are to capture the political weapon as they must for use in their own interests, they will have to give some better indication of their determination than is said to be expressed in this Parliamentary "Labour" Group. The position, of course, would be quite impossible were the working class aware of the cause of their condition; if they had knowledge of the remedy and had organized themselves upon a class basis. It is only possible because of the absence of that working-class knowledge and organization. Our purpose, within the limits of our capacity, is to impart the one and effect the other. It is the ostensible purpose of the "Labour Leaders" to do the same thing, but as on all the evidence their group is simply a manifestation of working-class confusion, they are clearly not doing it.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY versus LABOURISM.

Why the "Labour" Leaders are not educating and organizing the class they are alleged to lead is a question answered variously out of the mouths and out of the actions of the men themselves. Some, in ignorance perhaps, attach an exaggerated importance to getting into the House of Commons or other public chambers, ignoring the fact that should loom largest upon the mental horizon of one aspiring to be a Labour Leader, viz., that an elected person cannot outstrip the advance of his electorate and that, assuming success in "getting in" (which is usually achieved by obscuring as much as possible the real issues it is hoped may be raised so much more effectively inside) he must kick his heels impatiently until his constituents come up with him. Others, again it may be ignorance, think to effect the working-class purpose by pressing for certain reform measures which, as we have so frequently shewn, can by no chance whatever, permanently or in any material degree, ameliorate the unhappy lot of the wage-worker. Others, again, are quite transparently concerned mainly with their own advancement and are prepared to go to any safe lengths to facilitate it. But, honestly ignorant or otherwise, they are assuredly neither educating nor organizing the working-class. On the contrary their vacillations and puerilities; their halting half-measures and "evil communications" with capitalist representatives; their lack of emphasis on the one thing that really matters (Socialism) and their "damnable iteration" of the things that do not matter (Reforms) all these have an undoubted effect detrimental to the intellectual clarity and the effectual organization of the working-class.

Therefore, in the efforts which we are making to educate and organize the workers, we come into sharp conflict with the obscurantists and confusionists acclaimed as "Labour" Leaders both inside and outside the House of Commons. We regard them as enemies of Labour to be fought; their work as entanglements in the working-class path to be cut away.

And that is briefly the difference between us and the "Labour" group that Mr. Ramsay Macdonald is so prominent a member of.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

WHY THE LABOUR PARTY IS A FAILURE.

THE PRINTING TRADES DISPUTE.

ASQUITH'S WHITEWASHERS.

MR. FRANK SMITH has passed from the Salvation Army to the Labour Movement and from the Labour Movement to the Salvation Army until one hardly knows where he is at any given time. At present he appears to be in the Labour movement as the secretary of a side-tracking, self-appointed Committee, who advise the unemployed to deputise and to beg of their masters to recognise the "right" of their slaves to work, instead of pointing out that they, the slaves, should organise to end their slavery and establish their right to live. In this connection he has a bone to pick with the "Labour" Party in the House of Commons.

He complains that the "Labour" members are permitting, without protest, the Liberal Cabinet to fool with the unemployed question, and wonders what it is "that is sapping the fight out of the majority of the Labour members?" "What is it," he asks, "that appears to be turning the lions into lambs?" He suggests that they are forgetting that they are still agitators, with a wider platform and a greater opportunity to push the war into the camps of the enemy, and are attempting the rôle of "statesmen," and adds that they will lose their way and get side-tracked, for the politicians can beat them at the game of bluff every time.

The Executive of Mr. Smith's Committee includes G. N. Barnes, M.P., J. Keir Hardie, M.P., and J. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P. Has Mr. Smith discussed the matter with his Executive or does the Committee merely consist of Mr. Smith, and the pretence of an Executive merely part of a "game of bluff" which Mr. Smith, as well as his "Labour" Party friends, play so well?

Now why should the "Labour" M.P.'s be expected to "put up a real fight in the House"? They were not elected to put up a fight. Men who will throw over their principles of independence in order to secure votes, as did so many of the few Labour members who ever professed any, are not going to make a fight against the very men with whom they made compacts at the General Election.

Take Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald, for example. He made a compact with the Liberals of Leicester, because he was more anxious to get to the House of Commons than to fight the enemies of the working class. At the meeting at the Temperance Hall, Leicester, held on January 5th, where he was adopted, he expressed himself in hearty sympathy with the proposals of the government, as voiced by Sir H. Campbell Bannerman in his Albert Hall speech, and asked the working men of Leicester to use both votes in order that Mr. Broadbent and himself might be returned. He explained that "both the L.R.C. and the Trades Council had declared against 'plumping' in order that every member might utilise both his votes to return two Progressives, and so promote the more urgently needed industrial reforms." And the speech which he delivered after the poll was declared, quoted in our March issue, amply proves that he was returned to support the capitalist Liberal Government, not to put up a fight against it.

Then there is Mr. Will Crooks, M.P., who is also supposed to be one of the "independent" Labour M.P.'s. There has hardly been a Liberal function of any importance since the General Election that Mr. Crooks has not attended. In April, for instance, he and his wife were present at a back-scratching banquet at the Trocadero, which included "some of the best known

names in Liberal politics." The Lord Chancellor presided, Dr. Macnamara and Mr. H. C. Lea, M.P., were the head cooks and bottle washers, John Burns and Lord Monckswell spoke, and Mr. James Stuart and Sir H. Campbell Bannerman sent their congratulations by letter. The speeches mainly concerned the "great Radical victory," and many were the references to "the dark days from which Liber also had just emerged." Does any sane person expect that Mr. Crooks is going to "put up a real fight" against the exploiters whose hospitality he is so willing to accept?

Of course, at this function Mr. Crooks did not preach about the evils of drinking, smoking and gambling. That he reserves for the class to which he once belonged. It is part of the decoy-duck game he is playing for the capitalists.

Then we have Mr. Will Thorne, M.P., now made a Justice of the Peace for the Borough of West Ham, in which capacity he will be called upon to punish those victims of the capitalist system who have offended against capitalist laws, passed to protect capitalist property and capitalist institutions. Mr. Thorne is a member of the S.D.F., who, no doubt, will claim that a "revolutionary Social Democrat" can serve the working class and at the same time serve in the capacity of a tool of the capitalist class. There is now no real difference between Burns and Thorne, excepting that Burns is well paid for his job and Thorne is one of the great unpaid.

I am here reminded of the words of Wilhelm Liebknecht: "A Socialist who goes into a bourgeois government, either goes over to the enemy or else puts himself in the power of the enemy. . . . He may claim to be a Socialist, but he is no longer such. He may be convinced of his own sincerity, but in that case he has not comprehended the nature of the class struggle. . . . does not understand that the class struggle is the basis of Socialism."

Before elected persons can put up a real fight they must be elected to do so, they must have a guiding principle and a definite policy. They must know what they want and how they must go to work to get it. And above all, they must have the knowledge that behind their actions lies the full strength of the electors who voted for them and the non-electors who also helped to return them. They must clear their minds of the fallacy that place necessarily means power for those claiming to represent the working class. That power can only come when the working class understand their position, and will return men as rebels. "No compromise" must be the watchword, and as the "Labour" M.P.'s have not been returned as rebels, as they do not endeavour to enlighten the working class as to their position of wage slaves, as they merely hanker after reforms in a mild and quite respectable manner, they are useless to the working class, and therefore are, as they must be, a failure.

The dispute in the London Printing Trade has, apparently, only ended as far as the Compositors are concerned, and it is quite evident that in ending it the Compositors were guilty of two false moves—one in not recognising that the matter affected all the workers in the industry, and therefore that all should have been considered and consulted before any agreement was entered into, and another in falling so easily into the trap laid for them by the astute newspaper proprietors, who in future will form a separate employers' organisation, apart from the Master Printers' Association. If the Compositors were in a position to exact terms from the masters, they should have insisted that the cause of one employer should be considered the cause of all, that all the employers should join one and the same masters' association, and thus action against one would have been action against all. The policy of the working class is to get all its enemies, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, into one body in front of it.

A great and enthusiastic throng gathered together at the National Liberal Club on Friday,

June 16th to meet the members of the Government and to make merry over the Liberal victory. As might be expected, the Social Democratic Federation was represented—by Mr. A. E. Fletcher.

Mr. W. P. Byles has taken upon himself the whitewashing of Asquith, who, he claims, was in no way responsible for the murder of the Featherstone Miners. Against Mr. Byles' opinion we have Asquith's own avowal, previously quoted in these columns. It was made at Glasgow on the 17th October, 1893, and he said: "In his character as Secretary of State for the Home Department, it had been his duty to take executive action in more than one of those cases for the maintenance of the law and for the prevention of disorder, and he accepted the full responsibility for everything that had been done."

Of course, whatever Asquith's whitewashers may say, Asquith is bound to take the responsibility. If he repudiated it, it would be tantamount to admitting that the Imperial troops could be ordered to murder in cold blood the Imperial workers, at the instance of a local capitalist, without the consent of the Executive Government. It is too much to expect a member of the Executive Government to plead that the Government does not control the Executive's forces, and therefore Asquith takes the full responsibility. And glories in it, gloats over it, smiles in grim satisfaction at the thought that his class had so crushed the workers as to make it possible, without a protest, either from the workers outside or from the "Labour" Members who were then inside the House. They did not "put up a real fight" then, any more than the present "Labour" members will over questions which really concern the working class.

J. KAY.

ON PERSONALITIES.

A STANDING objection to us and our method of propaganda in press and on platform is that we are too personal. When all other criticism has been reasoned down, we can generally rely that our opponent for the time being will fling at us as the last word in the category of the objectionables—too personal. Generally, also, we get this dialectical missile hurled at us as our worthy critic hastens without the reach of any reply we may wish to make—which provokes in what I endeavour shall be my exceedingly charitable mind, the thought that the objector is more concerned with scoring a point at our expense than with urging an argument for the sake of truth.

Nevertheless, I am aware that the same objection seriously influences some number of persons to regard us unfavourably, so that it may be worth while to occupy a little space in an enquiry into the validity and the value of the objection.

My endeavour will be to shew, not that we do not use what is called personalities, but that such personal references as we make are entirely unobjectionable and are, indeed, absolutely indispensable to the elucidation of the problems and the discussion of the questions we direct our attention to as a Socialist Party. Not, of course, that the use of personalities is peculiar to a Socialist Party. Every other body of propagandists, from the occupants of professional chairs dilating upon the wonders of a universe, to the denizens of a pot-house dilating upon the virtues of a particular brand of four ale; from men of the standing of Ernst Haeckel to men of the lying of say, Dr. Torrey, all make the personal appeal, the personal reference, use the personal illustration. Even our friend the anti-personality man commits what he regards as the unpardonable sin in illustrating his objection by personal references to us. There is no subject under high heaven that can be discussed without personalities of one sort or another. We can hardly talk of the law of gravity without reference to Newton and without pointing our remarks upon the operation of the law by the illustration of the unfortunate men who have fallen out of balloons. Nor can we dissociate Darwin from evolution, Marx from the theory of value, Armour and Co. from the

recently disclosed horrors of embalmed beef, "Labour" Leaders from political impotency and the cause of working-class confusion and so on. These are all personal references and should be, if our objector's case is a good one, taboo. Does our objector agree? So far as the first four cases are concerned probably he does, but he disagrees about the last mentioned. Which means that he is in favor of some personalities sometimes. Then where does he draw his line? How does he discriminate?

If I know my honest objector well (as I think I do), his protest is not against the use of personalities at all. It is against the unfair and the unnecessary use of them. And his idea of the unfair and unnecessary personality is that one which for certain reasons is distasteful to him. He is an admirer say of Will Crooks or John Burns. He thinks they are good men who are striving wholeheartedly for the benefit of the working class. And when we lump them together among the crowd of working-class enemies, he is indignant and declaims our use of personalities. But when in our examination of the workings of Capitalism we make denunciatory references to the pork packers of Chicago who are prepared to poison the proletariat for personal profit, he says "hear, hear," and applauds vociferously.

Now why is this? It is in the one case because he can appreciate enough of the facts to know that our personal references to Armour and Co. are fair and necessary and serve as a forceful illustration of our argument, while in the other the references are not fair or necessary, because he has not appreciated the facts. Yet we are continually placing on record facts in proof of our arguments against Burns and Crooks, who we hold are poisoning the minds of the proletariat. We make our personal references to them serve as illustrations in just the same way as our personal references to the poisoned pork packers.

Why does not our friend appreciate the facts as much in the one case as in the other? Because in the case of Crooks or Burns he starts prejudiced in their favour and either will not listen to the facts at all, or dismisses them as personalities. Which simply means that he is in favor only of the personalities of approval so far as they are concerned and is in favor of the personalities of disapproval so far as we are concerned, because he usually stigmatizes us as "personality" purveyors of an objectionable type. But he it observed he approves the use of personalities in any case.

The same thing applies to our references to the I.L.P., the S.D.F. and similar bodies or members of similar bodies. It is frequently urged that we may and should go on our way preaching our gospel, regardless entirely of such men and organisations. But this is just as impossible as the omission of references to the individuals whose names are inextricably intermixed with such subjects as Evolution would be, were we discussing those subjects. As a Socialist Party, we have to face and deal with a doleful mass of working-class ignorance. To do so we have to face and deal with what we regard as contributing factors to working-class ignorance such as the organizations and individuals named. In their case we have the greater incentive because their existence is known of in every district that we can reach in our national propaganda work and we are, therefore, the more urgently called upon to shew cause why we, making for the goal which they too are ostensibly working toward, are yet dissociated from them. Moreover, even if it were possible to drop them from our consideration entirely, we should be discarding the potent illuminating force to be obtained from personal reference. Anything that may be fairly used to illustrate our argument and emphasise our attitude, should be utilised. We should be failing in our duty to our class were we to omit to do so. We should most certainly be voluntarily weakening ourselves as propagandists and to that extent should be defeating our own purposes. Incidentally we should be laying ourselves open also to the charge of cowardice from those who, knowing of the existence of these other bodies, observe that we studiously avoid tackling them.

Very well. The position narrows itself to this: personalities, so far from being objectionable, are proper and necessary, so long as they

are fair. A fair personality is one which expresses that which can be substantiated as true. If any objector thinks he has a case against us he must, therefore, shew that our personal references are unfair because they are untrue. If he can find any such and will point them out to us and so prove his objection, we, for our part will be very ready to withdraw and apologise. So far as I am aware, no such unfair reference has been made by members of this Party. If it has, I am quite confident that the Party will immediately repudiate it. We are out to speak the truth as we know it to the end that the working class knowing the truth may organize upon a sound basis and proceed along right lines towards their emancipation.

That is our business. Simply that and nothing more, and if in the process we come full tilt against the words or the deeds of the heroes of our good friend the conscientious objector to personalities, I hope that, before he stultifies himself by launching the personality of opprobrium against us, he will carefully weigh with what of calm, cool dispassionate discrimination he may, the facts and the argument which we adduce in support of our attitude. Then he will be the better able to judge whether we deserve dismissal from his or any other's consideration. In any case, I am sure a fair attention to this little screed will induce him to regard his objection to the use of personalities with rather less favor than at present.

AGRA.

"CLASS-CONSCIOUSNESS."

No point in the Socialist philosophy arouses such controversy as that of the "class-struggle" and "class-consciousness."

The confusion prevailing is only intensified by the use of these phrases by those who, while claiming to be Socialists, have altogether failed to grasp the meaning of the term. For example, the Rev. Conrad Noel recently filled the better part of a column in the *Daily Chronicle* with a criticism of that "over-insistence" upon the "Marxian Dogma" which has "done the cause of Socialism so much harm."

This criticism formed part of an article on the S.D.F., and the one thing the Rev. Conrad most objected to was the use of this term "class-consciousness."

"In the mouths of S.D.F. speakers it always means 'artisan-consciousness,'" he argued. This may well be—but it only proves, what readers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD know quite well, that the S.D.F. speakers do not understand the Socialism they profess. The S.D.F. uses Marxian phrases and fails to comprehend them; it employs the words of Revolution and the tactics of Reaction—the language of the proletariat and the deeds of the bourgeoisie.

[And it is as well to note that the Rev. Conrad Noel has since announced his intention of applying to become a member of the S.D.F.—"though not a 'class-conscious' one."]

His objection to the word "class-conscious" is twofold.

Firstly, it is, he thinks, impossible to reconcile the conflicting interests of the various sections of the working-class (clerks, artisans, labourers, &c.) and secondly, that "converts to Socialism from the ranks of the upper and middle-classes are a trifle puzzled—of what class are they to become conscious?"

The point here raised is crucial. Those who hold to the conception of the class-struggle logically deduce therefrom their revolutionary policy; those who deny or (what in practice comes to exactly the same thing) fail to comprehend it must adopt the attitude and policy of Reform and Compromise. What then is the meaning of this term "class-consciousness?"

At a certain stage in the life of every individual he acquires a "consciousness" of personal identity. He becomes aware of his distinctiveness, physically and mentally, from the external conditions which progressively stimulate his susceptibility to impressions, and possessed of a power to recall, combine, and analyse by successive stages of mental presentation these said impressions and emotions.

This sense of individuality, this power of ordered thought (briefly "consciousness"), is the result of the development of the requisite brain-organ; and, as each individual from con-

ception to maturity successively reproduces the stages through which the species as a whole has passed, by comparison we can ascertain the relative degree of development reached by any individual.

When an individual has become "conscious" has, that is, arrived at that stage of growth at which he perceives both the distinction and relation between himself and the rest of creation—he has acquired a power of reacting upon his environment; a power (limited but real) of "self-determination," within, of course, the possibilities set by his physical powers and the said environment.

Society is an organism progressing through stages of development.

The present stage is that in which classes have been differentiated within the Social Organism: the propertied bourgeoisie and the propertyless proletariat.

Whether they are aware of it or not their interests are conflicting. The workers fulfil the function of production, i.e., their associated labour adapts all natural resources to human use; the Bourgeois or Propertied Class retain ownership of the tool of production, appropriate the products and control the function of distribution.

Hence the social function of production (the prime necessity for social existence and development) is fettered and hampered by the survival of the obsolete bourgeois system of exchange—Bourgeois control of the social function of distribution.

Just as the chicken developing within the shell is compelled as a condition of further existence and development to burst the shell which had till then served as a necessary condition of further growth, so the working-class will sooner or later become conscious of this hindrance to their development—become conscious that they are the only useful class and progressive force in Society—conscious that they are potentially, the *Society of the Future*, and bursting the shell of Bourgeois political control and consequent economic domination, set themselves (and Society) free to commence a new and higher stage of evolution.

In a word: when conditions are ripe the working class will acquire, with the recognition of their place in Society, and of their constraint and that which constrains them, and a perception of the vital organic force impelling them to struggle, their *consciousness* as a class—their power of "self-determination."

To make the working class thus "conscious," it is necessary to make it understand the relation between it and the rest of (i.e., the other classes in) Society.

To achieve this result in the class, an effective majority of the individuals composing it must have acquired the capacity of seeing, behind their *apparent* diversity of interests (as clerks, weavers, spinners, hammerers, and diggers) their *real* community of interest as a class—must have recognised their common subjection to the necessity of selling their abilities in a common labour market; their consequent common exploitation, and their common interest to achieve emancipation as a class.

Such distinction as still survives between "skilled" and "unskilled" labour is being rapidly abolished by the extension of education on the one hand and the introduction of machinery on the other. And few know this better than the "skilled" workmen themselves.

Hence Conrad Noel's objection concerning the diversity of interests among the working class has no foundation. With regard to the vague use of Marxian terminology by Reformers posing as Revolutionists it must be noted that the stage at which a worker is brought to recognise that he is exploited by his particular employer, or he and his fellow-workers in their particular industry by their particular group of employers, is *not* the stage of class-consciousness—it is but the stage of class instincts; the rudimentary possibility of subsequent consciousness.

Class-consciousness on the part of any one worker thus entails the recognition by him of his place as a unit in a class, at present politically ruled and economically enslaved, whose historic mission it is to carry Society forward into a higher stage of development: the recognition that the interests and therefore impulses of the individuals composing either ruling or ruled classes respectively are mutual and those of the

two classes antagonistic, and consequently that the development of Society more and more produces a class-struggle for the possession of political power as a necessary pre-condition on the one hand for rule and on the other for emancipation.

The working-class-consciousness will express itself in a political organisation for the purpose of accomplishing this emancipation. That worker is class-conscious who has seen the duty of enlisting under the banner of Revolution in the Political Party of the workers—the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

With regard to the Rev. Conrad Noel's second objection little need be said. The Capitalist-class will only be converted to Socialism by the Social Revolution: the middle class by the Official Receiver—any isolated individuals from these classes who may enlist under the banner of Social Revolution by so doing desert their own class-standpoint for that of the working-class. They must accomplish the feat of lifting themselves intellectually above their own class-environment to the height from which, comprehending the process of social-development as a whole, they can foresee the inevitable triumph of the despised proletariat—a feat that few have the intellectual power to accomplish.

The middle-class man "converted" to Socialism is generally a source of grave danger to the working-class movement. Fastening upon the cruder manifestations of working-class instinct—he gives this instinct a Bourgeois Reformist turn and so hampers its growth. As "breadth of thought" and "toleration" he conceals the shallowness and superficiality common to his class: under the name of Socialism he preaches State-Capitalism. In place of Revolution he urges Reform. Upon the half-hearted and partially conscious efforts of the workers to organise the political party of their class he fastens as a "leader"—and all development is arrested.

Hence we are not concerned about "middle-class converts" to Socialism.

Socialism is possible when the workers, organised in the Socialist Party, proceed to establish it. When they do that, the whole of the "upper and middle" classes will be powerless to prevent them. Without the workers so consciously organised nothing can be done.

The first thing then is to make the working-men "class-conscious."

T. A. J.

THE NOTE BOOK.

It's come at last! I knew it would if we only kept at it long enough. When you call a man say, a thief, and prove it, he has no reply except perhaps "you're another." When we say a Party has sold out to the capitalist class and prove it, there is no reply possible except perhaps "so have you." After Camborne it is therefore not surprising that we should hear from the S.D.F. that we are financed by the capitalist class. The allegation comes from Bradford. I understand it's quite a common sort of charge against us there—in the S.D.F. branch. Dependent sayeth that this paper is run by a wealthy American gent (name and extent of financial resources unknown) who pours his wealth into our party exchequer to the end that we may break up the Socialist movement in this country. We are, it seems, bold bad persons of no delicacy, and we are also, at last, discovered—in Bradford.

It's such a pretty story that I am fain to withhold my hand from writing that which will burst it. Yet must I. Therefore be it known to all men that, like so much of the information that cometh out of the S.D.F., this story is entirely untrue. Unlike the S.D.F. this Party's Treasurer is not allowed to issue all-embracing items of expenditure such as "Ink and Sundries £53" or similar statements. He must give to all the membership a full detailed return of income and expenditure. These returns, supplied quarterly and annually, can be inspected by arrangement with any of our Branch secretaries, or through the Head Office. That should, I think, dispose of our American millionaire. Will the S.D.F. allow the same inspection of their books? or the I.L.P.? or any other party claiming to represent the working class as against the capitalist class?

Speaking for the S.D.F. at Tottenham, on Sunday, June 25th, Mr. Whitlock of the Stratford Branch, said "I would not have crossed my doorstep to vote for Will Thorne at the last election." Referring to an interview he had had the previous week with Mr. H. M. Hyndman he said "Mr. Hyndman declared himself utterly disgusted with the present Executive Committee of the S.D.F." Here's a pretty kettle of fish!

Mr. Hyndman utterly disgusted with his Executive and Mr. Whitlock utterly disgusted with Mr. Thorne. It's a great Party!

"Socialists don't desire to get into Parliament quickly: they desire to make Socialists. And they can make Socialists best by teaching Socialism, not by masquerading as 'Labour' men." This is not an extract from a back number of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD—it is from the "Answers to Correspondents" column of the *Clarion*, of all papers in the world! And the *Clarion* is a thick-and-thin supporter of the gentlemen masquerading as "Labour" men, and says that what the workers want is more of 'em! Well! Well! If consistency is a jewel the *Clarion* men must have realised on theirs very early in their career, if, indeed, they ever had it.

In reply to a question put to him in the House of Commons on May 23rd, Mr. John Burns said it was not true that he stated in 1886 that there were five millions of people in England on the verge of starvation. We fear that John Burns' memory, like most other official memories, has grown very short. Speaking from the Old Bailey Dock when on trial for conspiracy on April 9th, 1886, Mr. Burns said, "I say we cannot have in England as we have to-day, five millions living on the verge of pauperism, without gross discontent." This speech was published at the time in pamphlet form, and was sold widely. It has been sold by Burns' supporters and by Burns himself. A copy of it, unless I am very mistaken, is at the present time among Mr. Burns' collection. I have never heard of Burns repudiating the accuracy of his reported remarks before. It is only now, when it is brought up in evidence against his official view of the poverty problem that he denies it. Which brings us to this: either Burns was disseminating a falsehood then or he is disseminating a falsehood now. On the evidence of the supporters of the Party he belongs to, like Mr. Chiozza Money and Mr. Rowntree, the statement made at the Old Bailey must have been well within the mark. Therefore it is *now* that Mr. Burns is fabricating.

The question referred to was asked, I observe, by Mr. Will Thorne and Mr. Thorne is a regular reader of this paper, as I happen to know. And in this paper for May we reproduced extracts from Burns' speech in the Dock. The source of Mr. Thorne's information, therefore, is clearly THE SOCIALIST STANDARD; and not a bad source either. I commend Mr. Thorne's example to the other "Labour" members. A regular and careful perusal of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD would, I am sure, do them a world of good. The terms, gentlemen, are 1s. 6d. per annum, post free.

When Mr. Burns denied the accuracy of Mr. Thorne's statement, Mr. Thorne replied that he had the evidence in his pocket. A thousand pities Mr. Burns did not challenge its production.

I observe that the S.D.F. have endeavoured to secure kudos from the incident by reprinting the speech referred to. We published a few extracts only in order to effect a sharp contrast between the Burns of the eighties and the Burns of to-day. The possibility of reproducing the whole speech was discussed by us several months ago but, although we could see that it would find a ready sale, the idea was rejected because there would be no propagandist value in the document by itself. Like most of Burns' speeches (in this respect at any rate the gentleman has consistency) it was largely wind and bombast. Apart from their educational possibilities we have no concern with the publication

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST, July 1906.

SUNDAYS.	8th.	15th.	22nd.	29th.
Barking Broadway.	7.30 G. C. H. Carter	W. A. Cole	P. C. Herbert	J. H. Kennett
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30 T. W. Allen	H. Newman	F. E. Dawkins	A. Anderson
Finbury Park	7.30 H. Newman	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	J. Crump
Forest Gate, Dames Road	11.30 T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané
Fulham, Effie Road	6.0 C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson
Highbury Corner	7.45 T. A. Jackson	F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	Carter & Gifford
Jolly Butchers' Hill	7.0 E. Fairbrother	J. Crump	J. Fitzgerald	R. H. Kent
Manor Park Broadway	11.30 C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	J. Fitzgerald	T. A. Jackson
Paddington, Prince of Wales	11.30 R. H. Kent	J. H. Kennett	W. A. Cole	R. H. Kent
Peckham Rye	7.30 W. A. Cole	J. Fitzgerald	J. Crump	T. W. Allen
Tooting Broadway	11.30 J. H. Kennett	A. Anderson	P. C. Herbert	J. Fitzgerald
Tottenham, West Green Rd.	11.30 F. E. Dawkins	T. W. Allen	J. Kent	J. H. Kennett
Watford Market Place	6.0 T. W. Allen	J. Fitzgerald	G. C. H. Carter	P. C. Herbert
Ilford, Railway Station	7.0 R. H. Kent	T. W. Allen	H. Newman	J. Fitzgerald
Highbury Corner	11.30 A. Anderson	A. Anderson	J. Kent	A. Anderson
Tottenham, St. Ann's Rd.	7.30 A. Anderson	A. Anderson	J. H. Kennett	P. C. Herbert
Hornsey, Middle Lane	7.30 W. Gifford	H. Newman	E. Fairbrother	F. E. Dawkins
Upper Holloway, St. John's Pk.				
East Ham, opposite 'Ruskin'				
MONDAYS.	9th.	16th.	23rd.	30th.
Ilford, Railway Station	8.30 F. E. Dawkins	J. Fitzgerald	A. Anderson	J. Kent
WEDNESDAYS.	11th.	18th.	25th.	Aug. 1st.
Highbury Corner	8.30 T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané
THURSDAYS.	12th.	19th.	26th.	Aug. 2nd.
Tottenham, St. Ann's Rd.	8.30 J. H. Kennett	F. E. Dawkins	P. C. Herbert	A. Anderson
FRIDAYS.	13th.	20th.	27th.	Aug. 3rd.
Hornsey, Middle Lane	8.30 J. Crump	A. Anderson	R. H. Kent	F. E. Dawkins
Upper Holloway, St. John's Pk.	8.30 C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson	C. Lehané	T. A. Jackson
SATURDAYS.	7th.	14th.	21st.	28th.
East Ham, opposite 'Ruskin'	8.0 F. E. Dawkins	W. A. Cole	G. C. H. Carter	J. Kent

of pamphlets. Because it had no educational possibilities we rejected the Burns' speech pamphlet. For the same reason, apparently, the S.D.F. seized upon it. They are very welcome.

Mr. Thorne has, it seems, nearly arrived at the conclusion that if anything is to be done in the matter of the unemployed, they will have to do it themselves. "They," I presume, means the "Labour" members. William must have been very muddle-headed if he thought the Government was ever likely to do more than the exact equivalent of nothing. And William must be still more muddle-headed if he thinks the "Labour" members can do anything worth talking about. If William wants reasons and has preserved his back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, he will find any number of them have already appeared in our columns. If he wants any more, a note to the Editorial address will receive prompt attention.

On the authority of *The Labour Record*, this—while Parliament sits in the sweltering heat of these summer days discussing dogma, trifling about titles and often failing to take occasion by the hand, J. R. Clynes, the Labour representative for North East Manchester, sits quiet, emotionless, imperturbable, noting everything and forgetting nothing! Someday he will arouse himself—and then! "Lor! Someday he will arouse himself. Note that, impatience! Someday—and then? Well, frankly, I don't know what then; but I conclude, there's a good time coming boys—when Mr. Clynes arouses himself. We may wipe away all tears from our eyes—when Mr. Clynes arouses himself. And we shall have a time—when Mr. Clynes arouses himself. But why, oh, why! does he sit quiet, emotionless, imperturbable? Why doesn't he arouse himself?

Quoth the *Daily News* in adverse criticism of that prince of political judges Sir William Grantham (whose judicial calm and serenity by the way, appears to find highest expression in speech husky with emotion and watered with the bitterest of tears!)—"We do not complain of the Bodmin decision as it stands by itself. The serious part of the business is that the election at Bodmin should be declared void while the elections at Yarmouth and Maidstone are allowed to stand." The naïveté is charming. The serious part of the business, the part that really matters is that two Conservatives retain their seats while the poor Liberal loses his. If now, it had been two Liberals who had maintained their positions and a Conservative who had failed, it wouldn't have been nearly so serious a matter. Indeed, there would have been nothing at all calling for comment except per-

haps, the skilful discrimination and the even-handed justice of the be-wigged and very learned exponent of law on the Bench. As it is, the really serious part of the business to the Liberal *Daily News* is that all three Liberals have failed—two in their efforts to unseat their opponents and one in his effort to himself remain seated!

In the matter of the *Daily News*—can anyone tell me why its "Life and Labour" column now appears only about once a week? Was the writer too out-spoken, giving offence to too many good Liberals and true; or has the need for the maintenance of the fiction which the *Daily News* was so assiduous in disseminating about the time of the General Election, that the Liberal Party is the Party of the workers, the Party of Progress and industrial reform, etc., etc., *ad nauseam*, now ceased to exist? Many of those who take in, and are taken in by, the *Daily News*, incline to the first view. I accept the second. The good Liberals and true, don't mind the "Life and Labour" column fills so long as the writer is always careful to muddle the real issue of the irreconcilable antagonism existing between working-class interests and the interests of that section of capitalism represented in the Liberal Party.

It is time the good Liberals aforesaid could always rely upon the good Liberals in the editorial and sub-editorial chairs deleting anything particularly objectionable, but I don't think there would have ever been serious occasion for their intervention. Those who are familiar with the writings of the "Life and Labour" column man know how adroitly he can steer himself out of the danger zone while leaving in the mind of the casual reader the impression that he has faced the whole problem and arrived at the only conclusion. They know too that it is inconceivable that a man can get so near the truth without seeing it, and they know, therefore, that the writer referred to can be relied upon to say just enough and no more. It may consequently be fairly concluded that the *Daily News* does not now think it necessary to particularly emphasize the fiction mentioned. When the time comes again, as it surely will, the "Life and Labour" column or its equivalent will surely reappear as a regular feature.

Branch Secretaries and others
SHOULD NOTE THAT
JACOMB BROS.
Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

Printed by Jacob Bros., Ltd., 24 Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE
28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Malthew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

BEXLEY & DISTRICT.—R. A. V. Morris, Sec., Oxshott, Warren Rd., Bexley Heath. Branch meets Wednesdays at Sec's House at 8. Public Meetings, Market Place, Bexley Heath, Sundays at 8.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmingion Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmingion Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—A. E. Jacomb, Sec., 85, Forest Lane, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Secretary, 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Sundays at 3.30.

FULHAM.—E. Fairbrother, Secretary, 15, Musgrove Crescent, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—Communications to the Secretary, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Mondays at 9 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at the Branch Rooms, 29, The Parade, Tooting, which are open to members and friends every evening.

TOTTENHAM.—H. A. Young, Secretary, 46, Rosebery Gardens, Green Lanes, Harringay, N. Branch meets Mondays 8 p.m. at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Pk. Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following:
BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.
BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.
BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.
LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Laura Rogers, 15, Wallis Avenue.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.
CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.
SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.
POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.
SOCIALIST STANDARD
(Vol. I. Bound) 3s. 6d.
Unbound Copies 1 to 12 ... 1s. 6d.
Do. do. 13 to 21 ... 9d.
MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.
WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.
JONES' BOY ... 1½d.
SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.
HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1½d.
THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 6½d.
ALL POST FREE.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 24. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, AUGUST, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

FOUND OUT!

LABOUR LEADERS SELL THE UNION MEMBERS AND THEIR APOLOGIST GETS A WARM RECEPTION.

A mass meeting of railway men was held in the Palace Theatre, Newcastle, on July 15, to hear an address from Mr. Richard Bell, M.P., General Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, on the subject of the men's grievances as discussed at the recent conference.

Mr. Bell was received with applause and much booing, and failed to get a hearing for some minutes. After the chairman had intervened, Mr. Bell said the movement which was commenced in November, 1903, was an all-grades movement, which meant a movement in the interest and for the benefit of those for whom the Society's books were open for registration. Under the all-grades movement there would be in round figures 28,000 men, of which 11,000 were to-day members of the Society. He ventured to think that that was not given full consideration at the time the programme was formulated at Darlington in 1903. That programme had two points which, he ventured to think, had never had the full consideration of the men.

(Laughter.) If Mr. Bell continued after further interruption, the argument in support of higher pay for night duty was on the ground that night duty had so considerably increased, why not confine it to the grades thus affected? Instead of this, they were asking for time and a quarter for night duty for all grades. If they took time and a quarter for night duty for 28,000 men it meant that if everyone worked alternate weeks there would be a 12½ per cent. advance all round. The total cost of time and a quarter for night duty worked out by himself on under-estimated figures, amounted to £123,000 per annum. That was one item in the programme. Another was the demand for an advance of 2s. per week for men with under 24s. It was estimated that at least 18,000 men were now in receipt of wages under 24s. per week. (Cries of "shame.") If this increase were granted, it would mean an additional expenditure by the Company of £93,600 per annum. Here they had two items on the programme which alone would mean £216,000. (Cries of "What are the profits of the Company?" and "Are you here for the Company or the men?") He was there for the men—(laughter and booing)—and he was there to do that which was fair and just, in spite of all the hisses, hooting, and other circumstances.

The Chairman appealed for order. Mr. Bell (resuming) said at the first interview with the Company they were told point blank that the Company were not prepared to discuss certain items in the Darlington programme. They considered the situation and tabulated the grievances. The conference sat eleven days, and he believed they had got more than they could have secured by any other means. ("No.") There was absolutely no reduction to any single individual on the North Eastern system. (Uproar.) Enginemen and firemen would all benefit to the extent of £7,800 per annum. The shunters' hours had been brought down from ten to eight per day. There had been a slight improvement to passenger servants, and the increases altogether would amount to £25,000.

per annum. That had been obtained without a strike, without causing bad feeling between the Company and the men. (Derisive laughter.) Was he to accept, then, that they desired that ill-feeling should exist between the Company and the men? (Cries of "Yes.") Then they were about the funniest lot of men he had ever met. (Uproar.) The Executive had decided that he should write to the Company accepting the agreement and trusting that a conciliation board be formed. He was going to advise them to abide by the decision of the Executive. If some of the men had been itching for a strike, they must not forget that they had fellow-workmen in other places who had first to be considered. What had been done had been done in the interests of railway men alone, and he asked them to place some confidence in those whom they had elected.

Mr. James R. Bell, secretary of the all-grades movement, said he refused to sign an unconditional recommendation to accept the concessions, and only agreed when the matter was referred to the Darlington conference. That body considered the concessions, and asked that the men, through their branches, should have the opportunity of considering them. That opportunity was denied them by the Executive Committee. (Applause.)

Mr. Dickinson moved a resolution to the effect that that meeting of the all-grades movement absolutely refused to accept the decision of the Executive Committee, or of the deputation having control of the all-grades movement owing to the unconstitutional methods adopted, also that they should continue a movement of their own to secure time and a quarter for night duty and 2s. per week for men under 24s. per week. He said he did not believe there were 28,000 men in the North-Eastern system eligible to join their society. He thought they might take 8,000 off that number. Very few men would benefit by Mr. Bell's "substantial concessions."

Mr. Brodie seconded, and said they had heard the Company's side from Mr. Bell. He was going to put the men's side. Rule 13 provided that the men should be consulted. Their general secretary seemed to think the men had got an all-round advance, which was a mistake. Whilst the company were building big engines and putting two trains into one the men were getting nothing. The signalmen's advance of 1s. per week worked out at a 1s. per week reduction. (Laughter.)

Mr. Bell, in replying to the discussion, said he got his figures about the 28,000 workmen from Board of Trade returns. He disliked the sneers of men who talked about pilots getting only 4s. 3d. per day. Well, 4s. 3d. per day after seven years was better than 3s. 9d. which they had received. It was absurd to say that porters could look forward to a reduction. It had been said that only 3,000 men would benefit, but he calculated that 7,000 men would benefit. They could carry their resolution, but it would have no effect. They would get no support from the Society, as it was unconstitutional. (Loud hooting.) The resolution was carried and Mr. R. Bell was hissed as he left the platform.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE RIDDLE OF THE UNIVERSE, by Ernst Haeckel (Watts & Co.) 6d.
SECULAR EDUCATION, by Joseph McCabe (Watts & Co.) 6d.
SOCIALISM AND LABOUR POLICY, (Fabian Soc.) 1d.

A LOOK ROUND.

Loose phraseology is responsible for much misunderstanding concerning Socialism, and as it is often indulged in by professing Socialists it is small wonder that our opponents also sin.

Reynolds Newspaper often contains the statement, "A Socialist is one who advocates a more equitable division of property, and a better arrangement of the social relations of mankind than one which has hitherto existed." This could be said of almost all "social reformers" whether anti-Socialist or non-Socialist. They can and do advocate certain schemes with the object of bringing about such a change as is conveyed in the words quoted, and yet at the same time can and usually are violent antagonists of Socialism.

I therefore suggest that *Reynolds* should amend its ways and reply to future querists somewhat as follows: "A Socialist is one who advocates the establishment of a system of Society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community, holding that in present-day Society the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced, is enslaved by the capitalist or master class, who own the land, factories, railways, and other means of living."

"A more equitable division of property" and "a better arrangement of the social relations of mankind" could be brought about and still the working class could be slaves of the master class. Profit sharing, model factories, co-operative societies, land law reform, free maintenance, a minimum wage, could all be adopted and the workers would still be dominated by the master class, still lack that freedom which Socialism alone can bring, because Socialism alone attacks the foundations of Society, and aims at the abolition of that class ownership of the means of life which gives the owning class domination over the working class.

From *Reynolds* to Joseph Chamberlain. Speaking at the Savoy Hotel Banquet to the 1900 Club, Joseph Chamberlain exhorted the Unionist Party to "meet Socialism by pointing out how impossible were its methods, and how much better its objects could be secured in other ways. For one thing, they could point out how far fiscal reform would carry them in that direction."

H'm, Yes. Imagine any section of the Capitalist Party, whether of the *Reynolds* or Chamberlain label, helping to secure the object of Socialism, which object I have stated above! But let the Unionist Party and the Tariff Reformers come on. Let them meet us in public debate, and point out our impossible methods, and how they could bring about the object we have in view by Tariff Reform or by any other item in their program, a program which, as Mr. Balfour has remarked, is "not merely to be distinguished from Socialism, but is the direct opposite and the most effective antidote to Socialism."

In opposing Tariff Reform even Sir H. Campbell Bannerman was forced to admit that after 60 years of Free Trade we have 12,000,000 of our population on the verge of hunger. What reformers of all brands have to face is the indisputable fact that all over the world, no matter what political, fiscal, religious or other conditions obtain, the working class is poor and the master class is rich. Is this because there is not sufficient wealth produced to satisfy the needs of all? No. Is it that the working class is poor because its members do not work long enough or hard enough, or because they drink? No, for the master class drink and drinking does not then make poor; they are rich altho' "they toil not neither do they spin." The universal poverty of the working class, the fact that the producers of wealth lack the necessities and comforts of life, is due to the ownership of the wealth-producing instruments by the master class, which ownership enables them to control

the disposition of the wealth produced by the working class.

The *Woolwich Pioneer* reports a meeting held under the auspices of the local I.L.P., at which Mr. H. S. Wishart presided and Mr. Moore Bell delivered the address. In his opening remarks Mr. Bell stated he did not see that there should be any conflict between Labour and Liberalism, because Liberalism should mean the uplifting of the working classes, justice to the workers, fair play, and a fair distribution of wealth amongst the workers who produced it. The Labour Party stood for these and therefore there should be no conflict.

In view of the compacts made by I.L.P. candidates with Liberals at the recent General Election one is not surprised at such a speech by an I.L.P. lecturer. But a protest must be entered against members of such a Party as the I.L.P. calling themselves Socialists, whilst declaring that there should be no conflict between Liberalism and Labour. And as the Labour Party stand for the same things as Liberalism, where is the necessity for the separate existence of the "Labour" Party. Let them dissemble and join the Liberals.

It may be objected that the speaker did not say that there is no difference but that there should be none. But this was either loose phraseology on his part or ignorance of Liberalism. In either case it proves his unfitness to instruct the working class.

We have to consider not what Liberalism, in the opinion of Mr. Moore Bell, should be, but what it is. Like every other phase of capitalist politics, it stands for the domination of the master class over the working class. Its philosophy and that of the Socialist are as wide asunder as the poles. The one assumes, not only now, but for as long as any rate as its exponents will live, the existence of a subject class and a dominant class, and its efforts are directed to maintaining and entrenching the dominant class in its position. Now and again, as the exigencies of the political machine demand, it makes "concessions." But all the time it has one object and one alone in view, the strengthening of its position and the side-tracking of the working class out of the path that The Socialist Party urges it to follow.

On the other hand the philosophy of the Socialist finds expression in the belief that the working class, in the order of social evolution, will achieve its freedom from the domination of the master class, and is the last class to be emancipated. It holds that this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself, and not of the middle-class place hunters and rejected Liberal candidates who abound in the I.L.P., and it has therefore nothing in common with Liberalism or any other capitalist "ism." It is up against them all, all the time.

The Aston Strike, the strike of workers employed at Dunlops, has collapsed, all having returned to work whom the Company would take back. The men were members of Will Thorne's Gas Workers' Union, but, pleading a technical offence on the part of the Strikers, the Union refused to support them. But, of course, Mr. Thorne, M.P., J.P., is now a capitalist law enforcer as well as law maker, and, naturally, is a stickler for the "law."

Some three years ago, R. P. Houston & Co. started a line of steamers from Liverpool to Hamburg and another from Leith in order to compel the Union Castle Company to reduce freights. Houstons have now joined the Trust and, as a consequence, there has been a material all-round increase in general cargo freights.

During the past quarter the income of the London Society of Compositors, exclusive of balance brought forward, amounted to the sum of £8,865 19s. 7d., and the expenditure to £9,353 0s. 9d. The balance in hand on April 1st was £703 0s. 11d. and on July 1st £225 19s. 8½d. J. Kay.

ARE WE JUSTIFIED?

EVER since its formation it has been urged against The Socialist Party of Great Britain that its attitude towards reforms or palliatives was not wise. It is contended by many that the best policy consists in agitation for this or that reform with a view to assisting the workers to get something now. Not the least of the opposition to the propagation of Socialism and nothing less has come from the S.D.F., an organisation which devotes practically the whole of its energy to the advocacy of one palliative or another, at one time urging the working class to demand an 8 hours day or work for the unemployed, at another time advising them to concentrate their energy upon demanding from the capitalist class the state maintenance of school children, latterly coupling with this secular education. A consistent and unremitting agitation in favour of Socialism is, of course, not to be expected, as it would not suit the book of the controllers of that body, and would probably result in the loss of at least the more aristocratic of its members, who, judging by their actions, are in favour of anything but Socialism.

While it is true of the I.L.P. that they have always disavowed the class war (although sometimes voting for it, as at the Amsterdam Congress in 1904) the fact remains that they have occasionally told the public that Socialism would be an improvement on the present capitalist system, taking care, however, in doing so, to include the proviso that the said improvement must come to pass by a series of reforms which will bring us to the promised land of Socialism at some date too remote to be worth consideration at the present period.

The L.R.C. (now the Labour Party) at their conference held in Liverpool in January, 1905, carried with acclamation a resolution stating that their ultimate object is the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, etc. Neither in the speeches, writings, or actions of its advocates, however, can much trace of this ultimate object be found, the immediate object apparently taking up the whole of their time and energy. The immediate object while the general election was in progress was to get in, and numerous were the arrangements made to that end, as was shown very clearly in "Labour at the Polls" in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD for March, 1906. The immediate object since the election has been to vote almost without exception in the Liberal lobby, to make speeches which receive, and well merit, the congratulation of some of the wealthiest capitalists of the land, and to back such beautiful samples of capitalist legislation as the Brunner Bill for the better exploitation of children.

It cannot be denied, therefore, that all these organisations hold that the quickest way to change the conditions under which the working class exist is to work for reforms, relegating to the far distant future the only remedy—viz., Socialism.

Whether the immediate complaint be that the worker is suffering from too long hours, insufficient food, sweated conditions or any other of the evils inherent in capitalism, the S.P.G.B. has always maintained that nothing short of Socialism could possibly effect a cure, and has consequently steadfastly refused to be drawn into any reform agitation whatsoever, urging that the quickest way to get "something now" even is to organise to obtain the whole.

To those who pooh-pooh this view; to those who call us impossibilists for holding it; to those who imagine that they are practical politicians while we are in the clouds: to all these the following extract from Lord Avebury's speech on the burden of armaments made in the House of Lords on the 25th of May is offered for consideration.

"The unrest in Europe, the spread of Socialism, . . . was a warning to the governments and the governing classes that the condition of the working classes in Europe was becoming intolerable, and that if revolution were to be avoided some steps must be taken to increase wages, reduce the hours of labour, and lower the prices of the necessities of life."

It is granted that Lord Avebury has a big task on hand to convert some of the capitalists of this and other countries to his view; it is

granted that increase in wages, the lessening of the hours of labour, or the lowering of the prices of the necessities of life will not come into operation on the 1st of January, 1907; but the fact remains that a member of the exploiting class has shown to every thinking worker who cares to examine his statement, the conditions under which the capitalist class are prepared to give the working class those reforms for which some individuals profess so much anxiety.

Will the members of the organisations alluded to and all the rest of the reforming angels justify their position in the face of Lord Avebury's statement? Will they show in the face of this wherein the position of the S.P.G.B. is assailable?

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND TRADE UNIONISM.

[All Resolutions adopted during the course of this discussion have to be referred to the Party Membership through the Branches for ratification or otherwise. The decision of the Party will be published after the full Report of the Debate has appeared.]

[Continued from July issue.]

R. A. V. MORRIS moved the following resolution on behalf of the Bexley Branch:

Whereas the S.P.G.B. in its Manifesto recognises the necessity of Trade Unions under capitalism, and Whereas Trade Unions, as at present organised on sectional or craft lines, serve only to disunite the workers, and to give power and influence to a class of so-called labour leaders who betray and mislead the working class on both the political and economic fields,

And Whereas the only sound form of economic organisation is a union that shall (1) unite all sections of the working class on an industrial or non-sectional basis, and (2) organise them on the economic field for the complete overthrow of capitalism and the taking possession of all the instruments of production and distribution, as a necessary adjunct to the action of The Socialist Party on the political field,

Resolved that The Socialist Party of Great Britain hereby declares war on all Trade Unions as at present organised, and calls on its members to carry on an active propaganda as a preliminary to the establishment of a Socialist Union.

Morris said that Trade Unions organised on craft lines had the dual effect of misleading and dividing the working class and giving power to so-called labour leaders. The S.P.G.B. had been attacking the leaders on the political field, but it was from the economic organisation that they derived their power. We had to choose between the present Trade Unions and a union which would unite the workers on the basis of the class struggle. The idea that we should support the unions at times and oppose them at others was the famous S.D.F. position.

F. Leigh seconded the resolution. He said it appeared that the only party which could take any definite Trade Union action was that which advocated a revolutionary industrial organisation without affiliation to a political party. The economic condition was the basis of all working-class action. The L.R.C. was merely the reflex of the pure and simple Trade Unions which had put its men into power. The pure and simple Unions were playing into the hands of the capitalist, and were based on the perpetuation of the wages system. If the Trade Union is class-unconscious on the economic field the only logical attitude was to come out and fight them. The idea of domination by a political party was putting the cart before the horse. If you once create a revolutionary organisation on the economic field then you would have a united revolutionary political party. Political unity would follow. The economic organisation was in the forefront of the battle. We should be prepared to sacrifice a little against present unions.

Jackson said the people who had formed the I.W.W. were very fond of saying that the labour leaders were in the pay of the capitalist class. The following was the latest: "The striking silk weavers of Kaltenback and Stevens' shop have won the fight. Yesterday afternoon a committee had a conference with the employers, the result of which was the sanction of all the demands. The bosses granted the demands under the provisions that the weavers should try to organise all other silk mills also and bring them to the same scale of wages as Kaltenback and Stevens' shop."

Let the workers of the world organise for Socialism and refuse to be drawn from the straight path. They may rely upon it that the more determination they evince to follow this course the more frequently will speeches like the extract given be heard preceding the reforms that will be thrown to them, in order that Lord Avebury and Co. may secure a little longer time in which to enjoy the good things of life, and in order that the day when the working class shall come by its own may be postponed. "Something now" will be attained, not by agitating for reform, but by organising for revolution, a work which, in this country, The Socialist Party of Great Britain alone is performing. P.D.

SATURDAY, MAY 19th.

VIENNA RESTAURANT, CLEVELAND ST.

DISCUSSION ON BEXLEY RESOLUTION—Continued.

Jackson moved the following amendment:

Delete all after "Manifesto" and substitute: Affirms that the basis of the action of the Trade Unions must be a clear recognition of the position of the workers under capitalism and the class-struggle necessarily resulting therefrom.

This General Meeting of members of the S.P.G.B., in view of the fact that, "as the machinery of government (including the armed forces of the Nation) exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the workers must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery (including these forces) may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation," calls upon Trade Unionists to recognise that the class-struggle is thus in its full development necessarily a struggle for political power, and that until they have understood this they cannot act rightly.

And furthermore warns the workers of this land against those so-called Revolutionists who, advocating the Anarchist theory of the General Strike (more or less artfully disguised) neglect thus the above-cited, essentially political nature of the class-struggle, and neglecting it, ignore the truth.

Jackson said this conception of industrialism was either the old Trade Union idea or the Anarchist idea of the General Strike. All through the history of Socialism we had had this difference cropping up. What was the difference in the old International Workingman's Association between Marx and Bakounine? Simply that Marx said that the fight of the workers for their emancipation was chiefly a political one whilst the Bakouninists were clamouring for the General Strike which really ended in street riots. In this country there cropped up this new Trade Union movement. The Socialist League and members of the S.D.F. in their time formed what was practically an I.W.W., and laid it down that the struggle of the workers was to be fought on the economic field. And the Socialist League became Anarchist. In France practically the same thing was going on. He had with him the Manifesto of the General Confederation of Labour. In it was said: "The French Trades Unions unite the workers on an essentially economic basis, and endeavour to carry out as much as possible the following points: (1) They occupy themselves with ameliorating constantly the existing conditions of the workers by reduction in hours, increase of salary, the sanitary condition of factories and workshops, the moral independence of the workers, etc. They

do not forget that the reforms obtained from the employers cannot be a final aim, but only a step towards more radical amelioration. Also in order to be effective all reforms must be accompanied by a curtailment of capitalist privileges. (2) They do not limit their activity to partial and immediate reforms; convinced that only in the abolition of the wage system is the definite remedy of exploitation and human misery. They prepared the way for the capitalist expropriation, which making the Trades Unions and Trades Councils the centres of the new social life, will give to all the opportunity for integral development." That was precisely the argument in favour of Industrial Unionism—that the Trades Unions formed the basis of the future Society. As regards the General Strike they said: "The General Strike reveals itself under two aspects which complete themselves mutually and both have in a high degree a revolutionary character. The General Strike can have as its aim the immediate conquest of partial ameliorations; or it may be the equivalent of the proletarian revolution and imply the taking in possession of the whole social organism by the working class."

And again "Trades Unions will take as their mission the inauguration of communist property on the ruins of individual property."

"They will take possession of factories and workshops, and the Trades Unions in each industry, putting themselves in connection with their Federation, will regulate the amount of production."

That was precisely the position of the I.W.W. The essential aim of the revolutionary working-class party was the capture of the political machinery.

Anderson seconded the amendment. Certain political opponents of ours were ready to side-track our Party by this economic fake, and certain members of the S.P.G.B. were trying to do the same thing. Until all the members of the organisation were Socialist you would not have a sound economic organisation at all.

Leigh said he wished to oppose the amendment. He had had conversation with members of the S.L.P., and they had told him that they were ready to send out the men in their party who were keeping the two organisations apart. Jackson's amendment was purely a declaration against Anarchism, where the political organisation of the working class was condemned. To admit the necessity of an economic organisation of the working class and then to tie them down to a political party was to make the success of the economic organisation impossible. The theory of the economic organisation alone was the Anarchist theory purely and simply, but the resolution advocated a sound economic organisation to work in conjunction with a political party. It was untrue to say that he was being used by another party to break up this party. He had pointed out to Jackson that he was in favour of political action, yet Jackson was accusing him of advocating Anarchy.

Neumann said when we found our men had backed up the S.L.P. position as far as Industrial Unionism was concerned, he thought he was justified in saying that their action had been detrimental to the Party. It behooved members of the Party to set a firm face against this. It had been said by a speaker that some of the people of this hostile organisation were prepared to dispense with their leaders. Well, we had not yet seen much evidence of it. If they would have nothing to do with us politically we could have nothing to do with them economically. If, by any miracle, their new economic organisation should be compelled to take political action, it would be reform action due to the men who formed its membership. If the S.L.P. was as good a political party as the S.P.G.B.; if it had in the eyes of certain members a better industrial organisation, why did they remain in the S.P.G.B.?

[To be Continued.]

Branch Secretaries and others SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	6	0
Quarter Column do.	...	0	2 0
Half Column do.	...	0	5 6
One Column do.	...	0	10 0
One Column do.	...	1	0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY, AUG. 4, 1906.



THE SECOND MILESTONE.

In June we celebrated our second anniversary as a Party. With the present number we pass our second milestone as the Party's official mouthpiece.

Two years. It is not a long time. We are still quite a juvenile among organisations. We cannot boast on the score of longevity—yet. We have not, as a party, "borne for 25 years the heat and burden of the day," as certain elderly and very respectable members of other bodies claiming to be Socialist are for ever reminding us, and, for that matter, everyone else who ventures to criticise their present work; and we hope when we have as a party "borne the heat and burden of the day" for the allotted span, we shall not be so stupid as to suppose that our age is any necessary guarantee of infallible wisdom, nor be reduced to a pathetic reliance upon our hoary head as a sufficient defence for wrong action, as the venerable gentlemen aforementioned are wont to do.

Yes, we are still youthful—and virile. We have lived two years of strenuous life and falsified, by at least 18 months, the kindly prognostications (and we fear we must also say, hopes) of our good friends the enemy. And if it is any comfort to these same good friends we beg leave to state that our prospects of continued life are as favourable as ever. Indeed, more favourable, seeing that our work has enabled us to eliminate sources of weakness and establish ourselves as a working-class party, obtain international recognition, ensure that our printed vindication of the attitude we adopt shall circulate through the Socialist world Press, and maintain through our paper and from our platform a steady supply of facts and figures for the information and inspiration of that increasing working-class audience to whom we are able to address ourselves.

Two years—and our confidence in the correctness of the position we occupied at the outset, is unshaken and unchanged. In that time not one single happening, great or small, has done other than confirm our faith in the possibilities of uncompromising working-class action along clear-cut Socialist lines; not one single incident but intensifies our conviction of the utter fatuity of palliative propaganda. We set out to preach Socialism and Socialism only as the hope of

the worker, as his only way of escape from the appalling misery which environs his class and which, if it is not already in his daily experience, is removed from him by the smallest of spans, and we have preached it. We set out to show the utter folly of attempting to patch a system entirely rotten, and to urge that the only effect such patching could have was the prolongation of the life of that entirely rotten system—and we have shown it. We set out to prove that the enemies of the workers were not confined to the camp of Capitalism, but were actually in command of the camp of Labour, having been elected to their dominant positions by an ignorant proletariat—and we have shown it. Our purpose was to emphasise the fact that every worker or leader who was not organised in the ranks of The Socialist Party, waging war upon the forces of the capitalist class, was consciously or unconsciously lending aid to the enemies of the workers—and we have done that also. We set out to preach revolution as against reform; a boldly defined and unalterable working-class policy of open war upon the capitalist class as against paltering and compromise, with its inevitable results in working-class confusion; class organisation specifically for ultimate victory as against sectional organisation for an illusory "immediate advantage." That was our gospel two years ago: it is our gospel to-day.

PILLS FOR EARTHQUAKES.

The President of the Local Government Board has made his long promised and (by some) eagerly anticipated statement upon unemployment and what the great democratic, progressive, etc., etc. Liberal Government proposed as a solution for that vexatious problem. The introductory speech was, we understand, masterly. Probably. But it would require a speech a thousand times more masterly than the President is capable of, to obscure to even a poorly equipped mind, the real nature of the proposal made. The Liberal Party desire to burke discussion of the problem of unemployment. The Liberal Party will not because they cannot (although they must not, of course, admit that) take any more adequate steps in the matter than their predecessors in office. But the Liberal Party desire political kudos, because the Liberal Party require the support of the working class. Therefore, the Liberal Party must make a show of doing something so that the people may be deceived. That is where the President of the Local Government Board comes in. He has been hired to help make the show and deceive the people. That is his speciality; his forte. Nobody with any political knowledge worth talking about questions that to-day. So the President makes a masterly speech. The Conservative Government were no use. They could not deal with the unemployed problem. They passed a stupid bill on the subject, which had been practically useless. Now, the Liberal Government of which I, the President, am a not unimportant member (loud "Labour" cheers) are up a different street. They know how to deal with the unemployed problem. But they do not propose dealing with it yet. They have not sufficient data to work upon. It would be highly dangerous if by any ill-advised step, the outcome of undoubted and overpowering sympathy with the genuine unemployed, the sturdy independence of the working man were sapped or Labour was rendered less instead of, as it should be, more fluid. Of course the Government recognised how hard was the struggle against starvation, and it was therefore proposed to make a great grant of money from the national exchequer, in order that the useless act of the Conservative Government might have a better chance of showing how really useless it is, while the Liberal Government are collecting more information upon which presently they will be able to proceed with certainty. The grant will be distributed under my own presidential direction, and I will guarantee that nothing will be wasted. This, aided by working-class thrift and temperance—especially temperance (Hear

hear, from Mr. Crooks) should enable the unemployed to tide over next winter (sotto voce—or die in the attempt). The amount of the great grant would be £200,000 (Ministerial shrieks of delight) although I trust it will not be necessary to spend all that sum—and so on.

£200,000 to tide the unemployed over the winter! Was ever such a palpable fraud perpetrated by any government? Could any government have succeeded in foisting it upon a starving people without the assistance of a decoy like the President of the Local Government Board? Indeed, the President is earning his salary well. He is giving good value for money. £200,000 to tide the unemployed over the winter! All of them! And Mr. Lansbury says a larger sum could easily be consumed in Poplar! And the "Labour" group in Parliament puts up Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald to welcome the proposals, while Mr. Crooks is absolutely delighted, and says so. A fraud! a palpable, bare-faced fraud! Just the sort of fraud we expected. The Liberal Party can do nothing, but they must make a demonstration of doing something to save their face. And this is the something—this pill for an earthquake—expressly and obviously designed to put the whole matter off for a year. A fraud connived at by a "Labour" minister and condoned by a "Labour" Party. The working class have been gulled often in the past. It seems well-nigh incredible that they can be gulled this time.

PARTY NOTES.

ACCORDING to a writer in the *South London Mail* for July 13, a young man on Clapham Common said he had endeavoured to become a member of the S.P.G.B., but, in consequence of his being a Christian, he was refused admission.

This is a case where the writer, if he desires to do us justice, should produce his "young man." There are no "religious tests" applied to candidates for membership of this Party. All that is asked of them is their signature to our Declaration of Principles, after which their conduct must be in strict accordance therewith or they must leave the Party.

Last month we referred to a challenge issued by Mr. H. S. Wishart to debate the policy of the S.P.G.B. This gentleman, who is a prominent member of the Woolwich I.L.P. and chief local apologist for Mr. Will Crooks, M.P., now writes as under:—

200, Lakedale Road,
Plumstead.
7 July, 1906.

Wm. Gifford.
Dear Sir,

Your letter asking for a debate out of what transpired at Bexley Heath, was handed by me to the Bexley Heath Branch of the I.L.P.

The members of that branch decline to countenance such debate with any member of the S.P.G.B., so that I cannot take it up.

As a member of the I.L.P. I naturally prefer to fall in with the opinion of my fellow members so long as no question of principle is concerned.

Yours sincerely,
Henry Stewart Wishart.

Comment would be superfluous!

Our translation of Karl Kautsky's "Decline of Petty Industry" has been issued as a pamphlet under the title of "From Handicraft to Capitalism." Post free 1½d. Usual terms to branches and the trade.

Two comrades, both speakers, intend taking a cycling tour for a week, leaving London on August 11th. Any cycling comrades wishing to join them are requested to communicate with Head Office at once.

At last Saturday's meeting of the Q.D.M. it was decided to organise a Party Outing, to take place on the 2nd Sunday in September, at Watford.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain and The Socialist Labour Party.

A STATEMENT OF DIFFERENCES.

WHEN The Socialist Party of Great Britain was formed in June, 1904, the bulk of the members were sufficiently acquainted with the work and attitude of the Socialist Labour Party to render unnecessary at that time any further statement of the differences between the two bodies. New members have, however, since joined our Party, unacquainted with the facts, and several enquiries have been received from provincial correspondents for information upon the subject. Moreover, the refined literary criticism of our Party in the S.L.P. organ, *The Socialist*, has now taken the turn of stating that the difference between the parties consists in their respective attitudes towards trade unionism. It is therefore well at this stage to take up the matter for the benefit of those mentioned above, although to make the position clear it will be necessary to go back to the period preceding the formation of both bodies, the more so because both organisations were formed by, and in their early stages consisted almost entirely of, seceding members of the Social Democratic Federation.

For some time previous to the first secession in 1903 an agitation had been developing inside the Social Democratic Federation against the vacillating policy that the Executive Committee of that body had, with some success, been urging upon its members. This agitation had grown independently in London and Scotland, but, as subsequent events showed, in different ways. In Scotland it appears to have been organised, and its supporters worked as a regular faction. In London, however, no systematic course was followed. The supporters of an uncompromising policy (dubbed "Impossibilists" by Mr. H. Quelch) simply pushed forward their views at every opportunity, and supported each other when they came in contact without special plan or organisation.

At the Blackburn Conference of the S.D.F. in 1902, the so-called Impossibilist delegates from Scotland and London met and supported each other, the Scotsmen nominating Friedberg (a London "impossibilist") for the E.C. Friendly relations were established and the understanding arrived at that the London members would work in conjunction with the Scotch members for the adoption of an uncompromising policy by the S.D.F., Friedberg agreeing to act as correspondent for London.

The report of this Blackburn Conference as published contained some inaccuracies and left out some very important items of business. Friedberg wrote to *Justice* (the organ of the S.D.F.) pointing this out, and upon his corrections being refused publication, he sent a letter to the *Weekly People* of New York, detailing certain events of the Conference. For this he was expelled by the E.C. of the S.D.F., and as his branch (Finsbury Park) insisted upon retaining him as a member pending an appeal to the Annual Conference, it was dissolved. Against this the branch, of course, protested, and issued a statement to the S.D.F. branches. In this it was assisted by members in Scotland. While the above incidents were taking place, W. McGregor (one of the delegates to the Blackburn Conference from Scotland) came to London and after some months residence here returned. Shortly afterwards the surprising news reached London that he had been expelled from the Leith Branch. As he had always acted the part of a straight comrade in London, he and those who expelled him were written to for their respective versions, so that the Londoners might have an opportunity of judging the case. No information was supplied by Leith, but McGregor's statement was received and was supported by an independent communication from a member named Gillespie. According to this statement McGregor and others were present, as non-delegates, at the Scottish District Council Meeting held on February 8th, 1903. After the Council's ordinary business had concluded a meeting of the delegates from the branches run-

ning *The Socialist* was held, and before a secretary or chairman was appointed it was moved and seconded that "all those other than delegates leave the table." As McGregor was one of the Auditors (though not a delegate) and wished to know how the paper was being managed, he resented this, and when the delegates of his branch (Robertson and Drummond) gave in their report, he asked if they did not move and second the above resolution. Robertson denied all knowledge of it, while Drummond replied "there was a suggestion of that kind." Thereupon McGregor charged them with moving and seconding that resolution. Instead of hearing McGregor's case a committee of enquiry was appointed, who simply wrote to the other delegates asking if such a resolution had been brought forward at the meeting referred to. The answers were in the negative, for the simple reason given by Gillespie, who was appointed secretary and who, when asked why the resolution was not in the minutes pointed out not that no such thing had been proposed: it had been suggested before a secretary had been appointed, and therefore before any minutes were taken, or the meeting technically constituted. McGregor was called upon to withdraw, but as no refutation of his statement of fact was made and advantage was taken of this small technical point to refuse to consider any other portion of the gathering, he refused and was expelled—an inquiring kind of auditor thus being got rid of.

This was the first suspicious circumstance that came from Scotland.

A short time before this Friedberg had gone to Spain and Fitzgerald carried on such correspondence as was necessary with the Scotsmen.

About a week or so before the Shoreditch Conference 1903, letters were received from McGregor and Anderson, stating that a movement was on foot in Scotland to start a new party, and asking if the London "impossibilists" were aware of it. This was something of a thunderclap in the midst of the difficulties already existing—such as the Friedberg and Finsbury Park appeals. The correspondents were informed that nothing was known of this business in London, but as it was so close to the Conference and several Scotsmen would be in London on that occasion, the London section decided that no action should be taken other than to arrange for a joint meeting to discuss the whole business.

An incident confirming the foregoing occurred just previous to the Conference: the Leith Branch decided to send an ultimatum to the E.C., threatening withdrawal unless the compromising policy of the S.D.F. was dropped at the Conference. An attempt was made to persuade the Edinburgh and Glasgow Branches to adopt the same position for the reason (among others) that it was necessary for some branches to take the lead and then the rest of the "impossibilist" section would be obliged to follow them and form a new party.

At the Conference the expulsion of G. Yates, moved by the E.C., for his article entitled "The Official S.D.F." in *The Socialist*, was carried, the expulsion of Friedberg was confirmed, and the dissolution of the Finsbury Park Branch was upheld.

As Anderson and McGregor were in London at the Conference it was suggested by the London section that they should be invited to the joint meeting so that the differences might be cleared up. The Scotsmen, however, declined to go to the meeting unless these two men were excluded. While this was thought another peculiar attitude, it was finally agreed to.

This meeting produced another surprise. During the course of his speech upon the situation Yates stated that in Scotland they had been building up a new party during "the last two years." That is to say, during the whole time they were supposed to be working with the London section for the re-organisation of the

S.D.F., they were playing a double game by forming a new organisation in secret.

This statement, coupled with the previous facts, showed the Londoners that if they joined the party thus forming, they would be simply leaving one organisation where the leaders deceived and misled the rank and file to support and strengthen another whose prominent members were prepared to play the same game. Accepting the facts of the class war and the necessary deduction made by Marx from those facts, "that the emancipation of the working class must be the conscious work of the working class itself," the London section were no more ready to blindly follow would-be geniuses from Scotland than "highly educated" leaders from Queen Anne's Gate, and therefore, despite the set-back that these incidents naturally gave to the business in hand, and the fact that a few Londoners joined the new party, the rest of the section decided to go forward on the lines originally laid down. When, at the Burnley (1904) Conference, fear of further exposure of their underhand trickery impelled the E.C. of the S.D.F. to further expulsions, the London members, after two meetings at which the situation was discussed, so clearly indicated their attitude that the bulk of the active S.D.F. membership in London revolted and, withdrawing in an open, above-board manner, formed The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

This difference of principle forms the real and substantial difference between the two parties—a difference the S.L.P. has always endeavoured to obscure by trying to find some detail point upon which to hang a sample of that cultured criticism for which they have something of a reputation. (Gagrined at their failure to mislead the Londoners, they have thought to hide their disappointment in a lofty superiority expressing itself in such observations as the following:—

"Those timid souls (whom the S.L.P. will always find it hard to trust) i.e., those who against their expressed convictions have remained within this now discredited organisation [S.D.F.] have plucked up courage to give a gentle whine of protest, of course, on strictly constitutional lines." (*The Socialist*, Dec. 1903.) while at the time of the Burnley Conference a leading article said:—

"Some were sentenced to apologise and eat humble pie, and others were expelled. A meeting was held in London, after the return from the Conference, at which the expelled were largely supported and the result is that the London S.D.F. is rent asunder, and a considerable section will probably leave the Party and set up some sort of castle of cards of their own." (*The Socialist*, May, 1904.)

No doubt, as in the argument put forward by the Leith branch 12 months previously, they hoped that this section would see their "castle" collapse in a short time and that then they would gravitate towards the S.L.P. But they were soon undeceived, and their next issue stated:—

"Our London comrades are face to face with a new foe, or rather an old foe in another guise. As a result of the Burnley Conference of the S.D.F. about 100 members have left that organisation and are forming a party of their own. Eighteen months ago most of these men professed to believe in our principles and tactics, but when 12 months ago adherence to principle meant leaving the S.D.F. and tackling the forlorn hope of founding a new party they basely deserted us. The preliminary spade work necessary to the building up of such a party as ours, accompanied by the risk of failure, was too much for the knees of those men, and the joints giving way through fear, they flopped prostrate before the Holy Trinity, Hyndman, Burrows & Quelch, and craved mercy and forgiveness. And since the April Conference, 1903, their lives have been made miserable. Treated with contempt by the members of the Socialist Labour Party, sneered at, culled and ridiculed by their own organisation, they have been forced to save the small portion of self-respect still left by seceding from the S.D.F."

Emboldened by the success of the S.L.P., they have decided to form a new party, and rumour hath it that they have adopted a similar constitution to our party. Such is the tribute mediocrity renders to genius. Our London comrades may be assured of every help we can

give them in fighting this "Party of the Wobblers," and though the fight may tax the energies of our members, the S.L.P. is too well disciplined and firmly founded to be swept off its feet by such a flood as has been loosed by the Burnley (conference of the S.D.F.)" (*The Socialist*, June, 1904.)

The "success" which so "emboldened" us consisted, as far as London was concerned, in about 3 new members after more than twelve months existence! while in addition to the modest (and grammatical) reference to their party as a "genius," the material is supplied for a new definition of "basely desert." Evidently, according to this quotation, to refuse to blindly follow the lead of one set of tricksters, while you are engaged in a fight with another set, is to basely desert the first one!

The constitution of the S.L.P., then, and for some time after, had a "palliative" or "reform" programme as part, while The Socialist Party's constitution ignored such confusionist items.

When reporting the formation of the Wimbledon branch of the S.L.P. (since dissolved and its secretary, J. Grose, expelled) it was stated that this formation

"affords proof of the fact that in spite of the political mushroom growths that have made their appearance during the last month or two, in spite of the unscrupulous intrigues of those disgruntled individuals who are moving heaven and earth in London circles to gather together a party to enhance their political 'exchange-value,' the Socialist Labour Party is not only holding its own but is also annexing territory in the extreme South-West of London." (*The Socialist*, July, 1904.)

In the next issue "W.S.J." writes that this formation is a

"fitting reply to the group of intriguers whose sole aim and object appears to be the splitting of the Revolutionary Socialist movement in Great Britain. But we can afford to ignore them, knowing full well that their treachery will meet with due reward in the future, and knowing, too, that a party built on sound scientific principles, as the S.L.P. undoubtedly is, need never fear the puny attacks of parties composed of tin gods and their worshippers." (*The Socialist*, August, 1904.)—A method of ignoring an opponent that can only be compared to that of the Irishman who made a long journey in order to tell an enemy "to his face" that he was going to treat him with silent contempt!

At the De Leon Meeting in London, August 31st, the chairman, E. E. Hunter, said

"One result of the formation of the London branch (S.L.P.) was that we already had imitators here—a sincere form of flattery greatly appreciated by the S.L.P." (*The Socialist*, Oct., 1904.)

Evidently then, The Socialist Party, while being "base deserters," a "Party of Wobblers," "unscrupulous intriguers," who were "moving heaven and earth . . . to enhance their political 'exchange-value'" and whose "sole aim and object appears to be the splitting of the Revolutionary Socialist movement" are only imitators of the S.L.P. in these matters!

The International Congress was held at Amsterdam in 1904. While these congresses have never been purely Socialist congresses (as they allow organisations, that can by no stretch of language be called Socialist, to be represented thereat), yet this remains the only regular international gathering whereat the majority of Socialist parties are represented. This of course is well known to the various national parties, and a steadily growing section are endeavouring to ensure that future congresses shall be Socialist and nothing else. The point (as to the constitution of the Congress) is usually thrashed out at the Congress on the question of the right of entry and sometimes on the question of voting. At Amsterdam the Allemandist Party of France wished to have voting power independent of the two other French parties. This would have made an opportunity for fighting out the whole question of representation from the floor of Congress itself, but it was moved by those who wished to shelve the matter that it be referred to the Bureau. This motion the Scotch S.L.P. delegation supported, thus helping to prevent the question being dealt with in open Congress. It was decided by the Congress that credentials should be verified by each Nation. The S.L.P. delegation refused to submit their credentials

to the English section because it was "composed of people whom they condemn at home." The argument is doubly puerile. In the first place, for the purpose of obtaining provisional tickets they had already submitted their credentials to the International Bureau composed of Hardie, Hyndman, etc., whom they "condemn at home." In the second place they were already aware that the Congress had decided upon this course when they tried to obtain entry by other methods, while if they had been seated at all, they would have actually joined with those they condemn in an international meeting. (As a matter of fact for the first three days during which they sat in Congress they did so join with those they condemn.) They knew before they left Britain (if they knew anything of the international congresses at all) that these people would be present and would be accepted by the Bureau, and therefore they would be sitting with them (Hyndman & Co.) under any condition of entry that could have been expected to be in operation.

In spite of all this they have tried to claim that their action was the only consistent one to follow, while our delegates sacrificed their principle by taking their seats under the conditions laid down. If this is so then of course every other delegate who sat in the Congress was equally guilty. But when this is pointed out to our objectors; when it is shown that De Leon of the American S.L.P. (whom the Scotch S.L.P. parody on all occasions) sat with those he had continually denounced at home (the Socialist Party of America); when it is also pointed out that he acquiesced in the seating of the S.P. delegates in so far as he made no protest, and, stranger still, afterwards obtained a seat on the Bureau along with Hardie, Hyndman, and Hillquit—then the brilliant defence is put forward by the editor of *The Socialist* that De Leon submitted his credentials to himself. Sweetly simple! Then why did the Scotch delegates abstain from submitting their credentials to themselves? Because they were not a National delegation? But neither was De Leon. Then under the rule of entry his credentials must have been submitted to and accepted by the American Delegation, unless there is a means of evading the rule, in which case he might have given his friends the "tip." W. S. Jerman, in *The Socialist* for Jan., 1905, attempted to support the above thin editorial piffle by saying "they (the S.P.) no doubt thought they might pass it off with the aid of the stock-in-trade they brought out of the S.D.F., viz. 'lies.'" The "it" referred to being the point given above re De Leon's credentials. As Mr. Jerman was in possession of the facts given here before he wrote this statement he is particularly well situated to talk about lies.

In the same issue, in the "London Notes" appears a statement that the S.P.G.B. was "formed for the purpose of popularising Esperanto" but "of late has been giving its attention to politics"—a fair specimen of the veracity of their statements. The writer there deals with a challenge sent to our E.C. by the London Branch, S.L.P. and the answers given thereto, which are termed "evasions." Although these replies were lying before him, the writer, curiously enough, forgot to quote them, either in full or in part, but winds up by saying "they speak their volapuk with a decided S.D.F. accent." The impression that it is endeavoured to convey is that we refused to debate. The truth, as the letters would have shown, was that, while pointing out that set debates were only undertaken with recognised political parties, all our platforms were open to opposition, while the statement in our Declaration of Principles stating that "we waged war against all other political parties" was a standing challenge to any who cared to take it up.

Writing in the March (1905) *Socialist*, Mr. Jerman, after about a column of similar innuities to those already quoted, says "As I pointed out in my letter to *The Socialist*, I tumbled to the motives of our one-time impossibilist comrades in the S.D.F., they were out for something shady, and if anyone has been sucked in, that is their fault, for it was pointed out time and again what one man in particular was moving heaven and earth to obtain." Unfortunately we are again left without any information as to what we were "out for" or as to who the "one man in particular" who "was moving heaven and earth"—evidently a new Atlas with a double burden—was, or what he was out to "obtain."

The criticisms given above, extending over a period from a few months before the formation of our Party to nearly twelve months after, have a certain feature that may be specially noted—they are, without exception, remarks dealing with the political question and the political position of the two parties. Illuminating indeed, then, is the statement of the editor of *The Socialist* in reply to a correspondent signing himself "G.G." that "When the S.L.P. came into being, if there was one thing it was absolutely clear upon it was its hostility to the pure and simple Trade Unions" and laying it down that this is the point of difference between the two parties (March, 1906), while in a further reply to the same writer he says "When the S.P.G.B. has emancipated itself from S.D.F. traditions and obsessions by adopting a clean and consistent Trade Union policy, it will be time enough then to talk of joining hands", (April, 1906), for if this is correct, the whole of the criticism, extending over the period given, is inaccurate and misleading as it entirely fails to mention the Trade-Union question. We may be "base deserters," "unscrupulous intriguers," who are endeavouring to "enhance our political exchange-value" and who deal in lies, but if we only adopt "a clean and consistent Trade Union policy" we shall be whiter than snow and all will be well. But let us look at this matter a little closer. We are told that they were "absolutely clear" upon this question, yet, neither in the first Manifesto issued shortly after the Shoreditch Conference, nor in the second Manifesto, "The Party of the Workers," issued some months after, is the Trade Union question dealt with at all! Practically, with the exception of a rule stating that one of the duties of the E.C. is "the formation of Socialist unions," the first official pronouncement was in the Manifesto issued to the International Movement, in Feb., 1904, where they state their policy as "one of criticism and exposure in order to prepare the minds of the workers for the Socialist unions." Apparently although "absolutely clear" they require nearly a year to discover it! And as (in his second reply) the editor states that "the T.U. policy of the S.L.P. is the foundation upon which the Party is built" an organisation can exist for some time without any foundation!

But in what does their "clean and consistent Trade-Union policy" consist? First (aping the American S.L.P.), the adoption of a rule forbidding members to hold office in a present Trade Union, otherwise silence; then that their policy is to be one of "criticism and exposure" with the object of establishing Socialist unions as "that portion of the working-class army which conducts on the economic field *skirmishing* operations with the view to seizing small points of vantage, while all the time working in close conjunction with the *heavier and solid* regiments which carry out the *more serious* pitched battles on the *field of politics*" (Feb. 1904, italics ours.) Later it is stated that the Party will have to consider whether "the time is ripe for the formation of a Socialist union based on the lines of the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance and American Labor Union of America." Then still another change comes over the scene and, when the new union called "The Industrial Workers of the World" is started, the E.C. of the S.L.P. *without consulting their members* send a message of approval and pledge themselves to work to establish a British wing of the I.W.W. (Oct., 1905). When the question of starting I.W.W. clubs was discussed at the S.L.P. conference, the delegates from the two strongest branches (Edinburgh and Glasgow) had received instructions to oppose, but were told by J. C. Matheson that the clubs *would* be formed and so long as the members joining these clubs kept within the rules of the Party, the Party had no right to interfere with their activity on the economic field.

Evidently then the S.L.P. conception of a "clean and consistent trade union policy" is to repeat, parrot fashion, the decisions arrived at by the American S.L.P., including the contradiction of that Party's past position on the S.T. & L.A., wherein it was laid down that the Trade Union was the skirmishing force or arm that must be dominated by the political arm, with the present one on I.W.W., wherein it is stated that the economic arm must dominate the political, which it now seems is the skirmishing force.

When the S.P.G.B. was formed a series of Party Meetings were held and the question of our attitude towards the Trade Unions discussed, with the result that a decision was arrived at to carry on the fight for Socialism inside and outside the present unions, with the object of educating the members thereof into realising the necessity for accepting and adopting the Socialist position, —that decision has been adhered to ever since.

In the preface to his magnificent work, "Capital," Karl Marx says, "I paint the capitalist and the landlord in no sense *colour de rose*. But here individuals are dealt with only in so far as they are the personifications of economic categories, embodiments of particular class relations and class interests." When, therefore, in dealing with political and economic opponents, such beauties of literature as the extracts immediately following (all from the organ of the S.L.P.) are met with, one can only wonder what "economic category" or "particular class relation" these distorted, facial and physiological descriptions are "embodiments of." Old, however, is the remark "When you have no case abuse the opponent," and the specimens of profound and scholarly criticism quoted certainly convey a volume of information as to the amount of argument in the possession of those using them.

"A prognathous, drink-soddened rant." (Sep. 1903.) "Political Debauchees." (Jan., 1904.) "Flannel-mouthed S.D.F. organiser" (ibid) "the drivelling senilities of this dotard" (May, 1904.) " . . . an official of the I.L.P. . . . had wild, staring, maniacal eyes, black dishevelled hair, a sloping forehead, prognathous jaws, and the general appearance of a congenial idiot. These beauties, however, were hidden to some extent by his mouth, which was wide open . . . while from the pit of his stomach he emitted a

blood-curdling howl, the blind, instinctive, meaningless expression of a stricken beast." (Sep., 04.)

"The Lancashire fakir . . . with black hair, oily skin, shifty eyes, one-and-half inch forehead" (ibid.) "political swankers." (Mar., 1905.)

"A wild, scatty individual." (June, 1905.) "Pouring forth a torrent of gush and slobber." (May, 1906.)

"A flannel-mouthed, lank-haired, political individual with a pink complexion and a far-away look in his eyes." (ibid.)

"Who conducted himself . . . like an epileptic chimpanzee, whose spluttering, inarticulate malevolence . . . equalled the performances of the most besotted and befuddled Hyndmaniac." (July, 06.)

"G.G." in the second article referred to above says that when he asks the members of the S.P. why they started another party they cannot exactly define the cause, "for like all facts it is not the result of any one cause, but of many." (April, 1906.) While "G.G." quite forgot to state the "many causes" that would even approximately define the facts, his statement is correct in so far as the main cause itself has certain minor ones contributing their quota to increase the sum total. First and foremost is the difference of principle given above; while the vacillating policy of the S.L.P. on trade unionism and the gutter garbage ladled out as political criticism, complete the many causes that made it necessary for those who desired to spread the principles of Socialism among the working class and give correct instruction upon the economic categories and class relations of their position, to form a new party to carry on the propaganda of those principles, clean, straight and above board, and so organise the working class along the lines laid down in those principles, for their own emancipation.

WHAT IS THE FUNCTION OF THE CAPITALIST?

THE amazing assertion is sometimes heard that under Socialism the community will assume the function of the capitalist! This, too, from the lips of men popularly supposed to be Socialists. It would at first glance appear that the worst accusations of the enemy are supported by this, add that the robbery of the workers which is now done by the capitalist will become the function of the "nation," and that Socialism is but state capitalism.

When, however, these alleged Socialists are taken to task upon this question, it is found that their grave error has its foundation in their ignorance of the real function of the capitalist: for it is by them asserted that his function is the organisation of industry! In the face of the gluts and crises, the unemployed and the overworked in capitalist society, it is difficult to take this last assertion seriously; whilst it is, at best, only remotely excusable by the fact that capitalism, in spite of itself, leads up to the organisation of industry, which is Socialism.

Under capitalism, in the race for profits, it is a fact that the production of wealth in the individual factory becomes better organised, and that these organised units of production grow in size until they reach the "trust" stage. But although the community must seize these instruments which have matured in capitalist society in order that production and distribution may be organised; although, in fact, Socialism must stand on the economic foundations laid during capitalism, it is nevertheless no more true that the function of the capitalist is the organisation of industry than it is that the function of the criminal is to create houses of correction and a system of judicature because these follow from his presence.

Just as capital is that part of wealth which is used to obtain a profit, so the function of the capitalist, as such, is the obtaining of profit from the labour of others, in short, the robbery of the workers. This is quite obvious because the capitalist seeks his profit as readily in the disorganisation as in the organisation of production. Nevertheless, because the largest profits, on the whole, come from the better organised units of production; because in the evolution of industry "natural selection" in most cases favours organisation on a large scale, organised production has become a feature of

modern industry; a feature that must be controlled, perfected and socially co-ordinated with distribution before industry can really be organised, and the terrible antagonisms of growing poverty against growing wealth, and of increasing unemployment against more intense toil for those in work, can at last be ended.

In another way, equally, the assertion that the organisation of industry is the function of the capitalist can be seen to be nonsense. What comprises the "activities" of a typical modern capitalist? He will be found most of his time on the shores of the Mediterranean or at some other equally desirable place—organising industry? Not a bit of it; he is enjoying himself with his profits. Occasionally, it is true, he glances at the quotations on "Change with an eye to the purchase or sale of stock, and at certain intervals he receives his dividend warrants, which he sends to the banker and is credited with the dividends. He knows practically nothing but the names and share values of the various companies from which he draws his revenue. The whole of the organisation (or disorganisation as the case may be) is done by hired workers, and he, by the ownership of wealth, by the monopoly of the means whereby wealth is produced, is enabled to exact toll from those whose labour-power is their only property. He is master of the situation and all are eager to serve him; his manager in consideration of a promised increase in pay will endeavour to screw more profit for him from those beneath, and so on through the whole gamut of his slaves.

The ownership of the mine, land, railway, factory or machinery thus enables the capitalist to exert an economic tyranny over the non-possessors of wealth, robbing them of the fruits of their labour. It is those who work who are organising industry, and they, in broadcloth or fustian, are distinct from the capitalist; his peculiar function it is to obtain profit—somehow, for only while he can obtain it is he a capitalist.

Notwithstanding, then, the asseverations of alleged Socialists, whose deficient knowledge makes the task of the scientific Socialist so much more difficult, it is obvious that the function of the capitalist is not the organisation of industry, but the robbery of the workers. It is also obvious that the community under Socialism will not assume the function of the capitalist, but will abolish both the capitalist, as such, and his function; whilst the organisation of industry will at last become an accomplished fact with his disappearance.

F.C.W.

A "CLARION" MARE'S NEST.

The *Clarion* is a comic paper, but never more so than when it treats of economics. Its latest outbreak is entitled, with unconscious humour, "Mind Your Own Business," and advocates the adoption on a large scale of the Guernsey plan of raising money for municipal expenditure by issuing notes redeemable at 10s and acceptable in payment of taxes.

The people of Guernsey are reported to have raised £1,500 in this way, about 100 years ago, calling in £150 annually to be destroyed until the whole had been redeemed, and they are understood to have never repeated the experiment. The *Clarion* writer, however, to rid the municipalities of their debts and to obviate all further borrowings, advises the wholesale adoption of the Guernsey idea, no doubt upon the principle that since a man may take a fraction of a grain of strychnine without serious harm, he may therefore take a few ounces with impunity.

To show what an utter nostrum this currency fad is, it is only necessary to pass in review the conditions governing the currency.

The earliest form of exchange we have knowledge of is barter—the direct exchange of one thing of use for another, as, for example, cattle for implements of war, or these for ornaments, and so on. A stage higher in civilization we find the exchange of goods has become more frequent and that the old method of barter has become too cumbersome. Among tribes whose chief wealth was cattle we naturally find cattle being used as measure of the values of other things and as the medium of exchange. Cattle, however, soon gave place to the "precious metals," whose use for ornament, whose durability, convenience and divisibility peculiarly fit them for use as exchange medium or money.

Gold and silver would, therefore, tend to be generally accepted in exchange for other things of equal value: that is to say, for things requiring approximately the same amount of toil to obtain. With the further advance of Society, and the still greater frequency of exchange; the numerous disputes between buyer and seller respecting the quality or weight of the silver or gold used to facilitate exchange, led to the adoption of an official stamp or coinage to secure uniformity, and as a guarantee of weight and quality of the metal. Here we have money in its complete form; but whatever metal may be serving as the universal equivalent it had its origin as a simple commodity, and was singled out by reason of its convenience to serve as the expression of value in general.

It will now be seen that money is wealth, although the *Clarion* man cannot grasp the fact because he does not distinguish between popular and scientific terminology. Popular phraseology calls everything money which serves as circulating medium, whether it really be money or only a credit substitute for it. Accurately speaking, however, money comprises solely the coins of the standard metal; since notes and tokens are merely instruments of credit and not really money any more than theatre or soup tickets.

The significant fact is that to-day through no matter what mechanism of exchange, it is only those who have commodities for sale which are desired by others, who can exchange at all, either directly or indirectly; and only then when there are individuals in the same position as themselves (i.e., having commodities for sale desired by the other commodity owners) to exchange with. That fact is at the bottom of all exchange, whether the medium of circulation be gold, notes or whatnot. Clearly, then, the amount of circulating medium is determined by the value of the goods to be exchanged by these possessors of the desired commodities, who are facing each other so much more easily through the institution of money.

It is, therefore, the disorganisation of production and distribution which causes gluts and crises, and the currency fluctuates in quantity as required by the circulation of commodities.

The remedy, then, is not the inflation of the currency with paper, for that cannot improve the conditions of production, but to so organise industry that what is required is produced, and that those who produce are not robbed but get the full value of their product. The remedy, in short, is Socialism; and there are no short cuts

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST, August 1906.

SUNDAYS.		5th.	12th.	19th.	26th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30	E. Fawcett	W. A. Cole	J. Fitzgerald	G. C. H. Carter
"	7.30	H. Newman	E. Fairbrother	W. A. Cole	E. Fairbrother
Finbury Park	11.30	J. Fitzgerald	G. C. H. Carter	A. Anderson	F. E. Dawkins
"	6.0	W. Blenco	J. Fitzgerald	F. E. Dawkins	W. Gifford
Forest Gate, Dames Road	7.45	W. Gifford	A. Anderson	J. H. Kennett	J. Kent
Fulham, Effie Road	7.0	E. Fairbrother	E. Fawcett	H. Newman	T. W. Allen
Jolly Butchers' Hill	11.30	J. Crump	J. H. Kennett	T. W. Allen	J. H. Kennett
Manor Park Broadway	11.30	J. Kent	A. Anderson	W. A. Cole	J. Kent
Paddington, Prince of Wales	11.30	W. A. Cole	J. Fitzgerald	E. Fairbrother	A. Anderson
Peckham Rye	11.30	A. Anderson	Morrell & Killick	J. Crump	W. A. Cole
"	6.0	J. H. Kennett	W. A. Cole	G. C. H. Carter	A. Anderson
Tooting Broadway	7.0	G. C. H. Carter	J. Crump	J. Kent	W. A. Cole
Tottenham, Seven Sisters C'n't	11.30	F. E. Dawkins	W. Blenco	J. H. Kennett	R. Elrick
"	8.0	A. Anderson	W. Gifford	T. W. Allen	H. Newman
Watford Market Place	7.30	J. Fitzgerald	H. Newman	A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald
MONDAYS.		6th.	13th.	20th.	27th.
Ilford, Railway Station	8.30		J. H. Kennett	J. Kent	A. Anderson
Upton Park Railway Station	8.40	G. C. H. Carter	W. Gifford	G. C. H. Carter	W. Gifford
THURSDAYS.		9th.	16th.	23rd.	30th.
Tottenham, St. Ann's Rd.	8.30	F. E. Dawkins	J. H. Kennett	J. Kent	A. Anderson
FRIDAYS.		10th.	17th.	24th.	31st.
Hornsey, Middle Lane	8.30	A. Anderson	J. Crump	F. E. Dawkins	W. Blenco
SATURDAYS.		4th.	11th.	18th.	25th.
East Ham, opposite 'Ruskin'	8.0	G. C. H. Carter	W. Gifford	J. Kent	W. A. Cole

through the currency.

We can, by considering briefly the credit side of our question, more clearly see the childishness of the currency faddist's idea, that to be rolling in money we need only set our printing presses to work turning out millions of paper notes.

In a system of production for exchange a large amount of circulating medium is continually going from hand to hand, being sought after, not for its intrinsic worth, but for the purpose of being exchanged again for the article desired. Obviously, then, so long as the Government is stable and has a monopoly of the coinage, it, or its agents, may replace part of the currency by tokens or notes, provided always that the credit of the Government be good and that the total issue does not exceed the minimum amount of currency at par that is always required in circulation. The difficulty of making mere tokens acceptable is got over partly by their convenience, and by making them legal tender in payment of debt in certain proportions.

Should, however, the Government swell the currency beyond the amount which the circulation of commodities can absorb, then the standard is depreciated and the value of the circulating medium is diminished by the amount of the excess.

Modern Governments, in their own interests and from bitter experience, go quite as far as is safe in the issue of paper currency, (indeed, only the financially bankrupt oversteps this limit) and the more extensive use of symbols or tokens can only have the effect of increasing the speculative character of industry and adding to the existing distress; whilst if the paper issue inflates the currency beyond the amount needed at par to do the work, then prices rise and the separation of real and nominal value commences; and although a £1 note might still purchase a nominal £1 worth of provisions, the £1 worth of provisions would, with every fresh issue, grow smaller by degrees and beautifully less, the workers, as is usual, being the first to suffer.

From the time of the Assignats of the First French Republic to our own day we have numerous instances of the dire effect of the inflation of the currency with paper, and at the bar of history the currency faddist stands irrevocably condemned. For confirmation one has only to turn to some of the instances given by Mulhall and other statisticians, of the United States in 1836, 1864 and 1868; of Russia from 1817 onwards; of Austria from 1810 to 1850; of Italy in 1867; of Sweden in 1834, instances when the paper issues depreciated the currencies from 15 to 80 per cent., causing a corresponding rise in prices and terrible distress. Even in England in 1814 owing to an over issue of notes the price of an ounce of gold had risen (in notes) from £3 17s. 10½d. to £5 4s., other prices rising proportionately.

We see, then, how "credit money" works in practice, and to clearly understand why that is

so let us here recall the economic law:—"The amount of circulating medium that can be absorbed is governed by the sum of the prices of the commodities to be purchased during any period, divided by the number of times the average £1 in coin or notes changes hands during that time." If the amount exceeds this there is an over-supply of the medium and prices rise, for the currency is depreciated. Paper is not hoarded, since it is entirely useless and valueless out of circulation, the gold is held in preference, (since it is intrinsically of value) and, if the currency is depreciated by an over-issue of notes, the gold remaining in circulation becomes more valuable as bullion than as coin, and is consequently melted down or exported. Thus it is that "bad money drives out good." With a sufficient margin of standard metal circulating side by side with notes the currency adjusts itself naturally to the fluctuations of trade by the coining or the melting down of gold, but if all the gold be driven out of circulation, then every fluctuation in the volume of trade causes either a shortage or an over-supply of circulating medium with corresponding fluctuations in prices; because a pure paper currency even under the best conditions can only be adjusted artificially to the fluctuations in the amount of trade, and that only when the evil has been made manifest by the rise or fall in prices.

But, it may be objected, although you show us under what conditions notes may circulate and the limits under economic law to their quantity, you do not show why municipalities cannot issue notes in order to avoid borrowing. Having disposed of the general principle of the "paper money" faddist, let us answer this final objection.

Provided that sufficient of the standard metal is left in circulation as a safety valve to provide against fluctuations, and the notes are issued cautiously and from one central authority, municipalities may issue notes with safety as Guernsey is reputed to have done. Those, however, of the middle class who are anxious to reduce taxation by this means, conveniently forget that by the proposed redemption of the notes in payment of taxes a large portion of the revenue is thereby turned into so much unprofitable waste paper. The point which we wish to emphasise in this connection is that the amount the municipalities can issue, even under the most favourable conditions, is ludicrously small compared with their needs; and that is the joke.

In the first place, by far the greater part of the commerce of this country is carried on already (as far as the master class is concerned) by means of a perfectly sound system of credit. As long ago as 1889 the business of the principal clearing houses alone amounted to £7,620,000,000 for the year. Indeed, as Marx has pointed out, gold is practically driven into the retail trade, and the amount in circulation is much smaller than most people suppose, whilst it does not increase proportionately to

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:
28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—A. E. Jacob, Sec., 85, Forest Lane, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Secretary, 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Sundays at 3.30.

FULHAM.—E. Fairbrother, Secretary, 15, Musgrove Crescent, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—Communications to the Secretary, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Mondays at 9 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at the Branch Rooms, 29, The Parade, Tooting, which are open to members and friends every evening.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets Mondays 8 p.m., at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road. Thos. Dicks, Secretary.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Pk. Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following:
BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.
BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.
BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.
LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Laura Rogers, 15, Wallis Avenue.

the increase in trade.

In order to give the municipal note enthusiast plenty of rope, we may even for the moment disregard the historic and economic evidence which, as we have seen, shows the dangers of an increase in "paper money;" we may even assume that the amount of gold in circulation may be entirely replaced by credit notes. They admittedly cannot exceed this without causing a depreciation of the currency and a rise in prices. But, when all the gold is driven out of circulation by the notes, where are we then?

Mulhall shows the amount of gold circulating in this country to be about £102,500,000. We will, therefore, please the currency faddist, assume that no ill effects follow the displacement of this sum by notes. Now (excuse me smiling) the outstanding liabilities on loans of local authorities in Great Britain are over £400,000,000, or about four times as much as would be available from the currency! Could folly farther go? Some even have intimated that the National Debt also could be liquidated by this means, but the National Debt alone is over £762,000,000. Yet it is proposed to make the currency an universal milch-cow!

Verily, instead of a milch-cow the *Clarion* has found a Mare's Nest.
F.C.W.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 25. VOL. 3.]

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

WHY ARE WE REVOLUTIONARY?

The Reformer's "Case."

PROBABLY few of our comrades have failed to meet the kind of working-man who cannot repress his disgust at the depravity of those of the working class who adopt an attitude of political antagonism to the heaven-appointed "classes,"—the working-man who apes the nauseating mannerisms and shallow opinions of the middle class under the impression that it is "respectable" and "superior" to do so. Such superficial minds as our would-be superior friend fall an easy prey to the charlatan who devotes his energies to rounding up the workers to the support of middle class interests.

When such a "superior" person condescends to speak to the revolutionary Socialist, it is often to repeat, parrot like, the formula: "Don't be ridiculously extreme and shout for the moon. You must be prepared to work with anybody who is going even a little way in your direction. It is nonsense to talk of revolution. You must work for Socialism in small doses, such as Nationalisation of the Land, Mines or Railways, or Work for the Unemployed; for these are practical steps of a ladder reaching to Socialism."

The answer to this parrot cry is not difficult, and need not be long. Rarely, however, can our opponents be got to discuss this important matter so we would fain do so here, the more readily since such an attitude toward Revolutionary Socialism is a very common one. It betrays a misconception of the meaning of the word "revolution," and an outlook upon political affairs that is by no means taken from the standpoint of the working-man's well-being; and this results from a blindness to the class structure of Society and to the real purpose of the "reforms" that are so loudly advocated.

In politics, owing to the diversity of interests which divides men into classes, it is safe to say that no change from one form of Society to another has been accomplished without a period of revolution. Russia to-day, in her transition from Feudal to Capitalist rule is a modern example of the revolutionary period. Revolution, however, is not synonymous with bloodshed and disorder, (although owing to the blindness of vested interests they often go together). It means something quite distinct, to wit, the control of political power by a fresh class, whether accomplished peaceably or the reverse. It is of necessity a period of more than usually rapid change, for the new class immediately seek to use their newly acquired power for the purpose of bringing the political system more in accord with their own interests.

That which determines the directions of the various class interests, and in fact forms the basis of political Society, is the manner in which wealth is obtained and distributed; but the manner in which wealth is produced changes gradually along the line of least resistance, (in the direction of greater economy), and is in reality an evolution of industry, taking industry in its widest sense.

This changing industrial basis enables favour-

ably situated groups (a class) to command greater wealth, to become increasingly powerful, in short to become the "fittest" under the prevailing conditions. The warlike rulers of Asiatic Society, the Patricians and slave-holders of Antique, and the Lords of Feudal Society, are examples of this, as are the capitalists of modern times.

Although a rising class becomes more and more powerful it is unable to make any deep and lasting impression to its advantage on the political affairs of the country until its power is greater than that of the hitherto ruling class; for the ruling class controls not only the making of laws but also the administration of the laws that are made.

In almost every instance the class suited to the outworn form of Society has clung tenaciously to power in face of the growing opposition. It has, aided by the advantage of possession, clung to its interests, to the spoils of power, in short to its existence as a class, until forcibly ejected by the more virile power beneath. Of this fact history gives repeated instances, at times as in the great French Revolution at one fell swoop, at others as during the English Rebellion and Revolution as the culmination of a series of more or less violent oscillations. In truth all history is the record of a series of class struggles thinly veiled.

The importance of a recognition of this class structure of Society can hardly be over-estimated, for it alone can keep the working-man's policy clear and show him the way to his complete emancipation.

Upon the basis of the class struggle the policy of reform pedlars and sentimentalists stands condemned, because it is obvious that the ruling class can, and will always so long as they rule, thwart the aspirations and interests of the class upon which they live. The ruling caste can and will by their control of legislation and administration prevent the people's will being done in any particular that clashes with the interests of the master class. The only hope of the people is to dislodge their oppressors.

We see, then, that the revolution is the culmination of evolution; the landmark, as it were, in the evolution of Society. Taken in its broad aspect the revolutionary method is seen to be logical, and when contrasted with the methods of the reformer who seeks Socialism on the instalment plan, this fact is made still more striking.

Let us by analysis of a typical radical reform or two show what is meant. The panacea of Railway Nationalisation is an example to hand. The annual waste of separate railway management and working in this country is estimated at £30,000,000. Nationalisation would therefore, in addition to other economies, considerably reduce the amount of labour (number of workmen) required to work the railways. Not only would it cause the discharge of those required to run the superfluous trains now running (through the waste of competition) nearly empty to many towns, but even though by reduction of tariff extra business were attracted

to the railways, it would mean the discharge of those working the other means of transport thereby out-competed. Nationalisation of the Railways under capitalist rule will therefore

tend to increase the unemployed and to intensify competition on the labour market. It is a reform that may safely be left to capitalist interests. It is an advance in organisation and

economy obviously,—for the master class; and so long as the workers are a subject class the benefits of the inevitable improvements in organisation, efficiency and economy, will go to their masters. It is by no means our purpose to oppose reforms, but to show that the workers can only derive benefit therefrom when they control political power. Under capitalism profits would be made for Bondholders and in relief of capitalist taxes by such reforms as Railway Nationalisation, whilst the workers would be more under control of the capitalists united in government as in Germany and Austria.

The same applies to most municipal and national monopolies under the present regime. Their object is to save rates and taxes and to economise "labour." Like the Trusts (to which they are placed in apparent opposition) they represent economic advance, and like them also they are intended to enable sections of the ruling class to extract more wealth from the labour of the people. And it is this that is the secret of the advocacy of these "reforms" by the bureaucrats and ratepayers of the middle class.

We cannot stem, and have no wish to stem, the march of economic progress, but we are forced to recognise the unpleasant fact that so long as capitalists control the State every increase in industrial organisation and economy renders the workers more redundant and their existence more precarious; and this unpleasant fact provides at once the necessity and the stimulus for our revolutionary propaganda.

The reformer, denying the class struggle, mistakes the progressive organisation of production for the progressive improvement in the lot of the working class, and ignores the fact that the fruits of organised production are denied to the wage-slaves until they emerge victorious from that very class struggle.

Land and mine nationalisation are also mentioned as "reforms" to benefit the workers, forsooth. But again it is the Bondholder, the Landowner and, perhaps, the Capitalist Farmer who would benefit, while the labourer remains a slave with his wage kept down by competition as now. And even if he could hire land cheaply from the Government he would be utterly unable to compete with organised capital at home and abroad.

Then we come to what is perhaps the most fatuous of all the reform cries: "Work for the Unemployed." The unemployed can never be abolished under capitalism, as every Socialist is aware. The progressive displacement of the workman by the machine must continue and the capitalist could not, if he would, prevent it. A reserve army of labour is necessary to pro-

vide for the expansion of production in times of good trade; and, in times of bad trade, when every capitalist feels how necessary it is to keep down expenses, the unemployed are a godsend to him, for they enable him to reduce the wages of those in work.

Let our reformers try to imagine what would happen if there were no unemployed. Instead of men undercutting one another to gain employment we should have employers bidding against each other for additional workmen. Just imagine a strike taking place with none to take the place of the strikers! One has visions of the re-enactment of the Statute of Labourers, of profits vanishing, wages rising, and capitalists working for their living!

The master class realise this to the full and will never even attempt to solve the unemployed problem. They will promise, and give a few crumbs in charity, or exploit a few of the out-of-workers by setting them to useful work at half the usual rates, but—give work to all? Never! Their very existence depends upon it.

The abolition of the unemployed is a "reform" that it will require a social revolution to accomplish.

The great problem would, however, be untouched by the majority of the reforms proposed. Various sections of the exploiting class would benefit, but, even though these reforms were inscribed upon the tablets of the law, the workers would remain competitive wage slaves and a subject class. We have always to remember that all energy spent on these side issues is lost to the great movement forward.

The working class have their own battle to fight in unconquering opposition to the interests arrayed against them, to the end that production organised now by Company, Trust, and State may be then co-ordinated and controlled by and for those who produce the wealth: in order that improvements in production may lighten the worker's burden instead of throwing him out of work or intensifying his toil; in order that an increase in productivity may increase his wealth instead of glutting a market and starving his family. But this Industrial Democracy is a possibility only when the capitalist class have ceased to rule the State. Hence the class struggle is the greatest struggle, and the revolutionary method the only correct one.

F.C.W.

TOTTENHAM BRANCH REPORT.

No compromising! No slackening! No suspension of hostilities. We are still at it,—and still winning. Despite the threats of a section of the Shopocracy we still retain full possession of the "fort" at St. Ann's (where the Band played once) and there our Thursday evening meetings continue to arouse the intelligent interest of large audiences. At West Green Corner our Sunday morning and evening meetings (which occupy some six hours of the day of Rest), continue likewise splendid propaganda efforts. In addition to maintaining these three stations we sent out a scouting party and on its report dispatched a detachment which on the 14th July captured the "fort" at the "Salisbury," Haringay, and there every Saturday evening successful meetings have since been held. Altogether since the beginning of July till the time of writing we have held over 30 very good propaganda meetings and have, at the request of the Executive Committee, undertaken the charge of meetings in Finsbury Park, where already two good meetings have been held.

As a result of this activity the Branch is in thorough good fighting form, and its Business Meetings (which are often attended by members of the public) show clearly that our recruits, young and old, realise the serious import of the Socialist Mission and are determined to take a worthy part therein.

A public challenge to debate has been accepted by a Mr. Davis, a well-known Liberal, and when this comes off a splendid opportunity will be given us to show the Workers wherein lies the path to Social Salvation.

Our membership is increasing but as this may meet the eye of some who have not yet decided, let us just say that we have room for a few more and plenty for them to do. Get a move on! Will ye?

T.D.

A LOOK ROUND.

A MUNICIPAL bye-election has just occurred at Northampton. The Liberals and Conservatives united upon a candidate, who was successful with 1,021 votes. The unsuccessful candidate stood as a Socialist, but polled only 463 votes.

In the report of the contest appearing in the *Northampton Pioneer*, a writer says, "The inaction of the workers was most deplorable. Thousands of them refrained from going to the poll. . . . Many of the Socialists even abstained from voting. This, I have ascertained, was due in many instances to their belief in the impossibility of Cde. Wright's success. In one street alone six or seven Socialists would not go to the polling booth, because they thought our candidate was bound to be defeated."

Personally, I believe that Socialists, when a definite policy has been decided upon, will pursue that policy, without regard to the prospects of immediate success. When once the workers become class-conscious, understand the one and only cause of their universal poverty, and that nothing but the Social Revolution will effect a change, there will be no occasion to complain of their inaction. But to induce a man to vote for a "Socialist" candidate because his program contains a number of "reforms" which it is hoped the capitalist class may be induced to concede, does not make him class-conscious.

The fact that a candidate's program may have a "Socialist objective" does not alter the position. In the canvassing and campaigning generally that usually receives very little reference. It is the "immediate reforms" that are kept to the front, with the object of tickling the ears of the electors sufficiently to induce them to record their votes. One man votes "Socialist" because the candidate favours a minimum wage of 30/- a week; another because he advocates that children should have one free meal a day, and so on; but it can't be claimed that they understand the principles of Socialism, and therefore they are an unreliable quantity.

And often candidates with a "Socialist objective" do not understand the principles of Socialism how to translate those principles into intelligent action. When such are elected they are hampered by lack of knowledge as well as lack of opportunity, and the cause of Socialism thereby suffers.

As with individuals, so with societies. It is claimed, for instance, that the Gas Workers' Union and the Engineers' Society have a "Socialist objective," but that has not prevented the E.C. of the former sending W. Thorne to support capitalist candidates, thus acting as a decoy duck for the master class, nor the latter subscribing to John Burns' Wages Fund. Merely having a "Socialist objective" does not make a society, political or industrial, a class-conscious, revolutionary Socialist organisation, whatever high-sounding title may be given to it.

John Knight & Sons, Ltd., Soap Makers, Silvertown, have just declared the result of the second year's working of their bonus scheme. The Managing Director pointed out that they had had to face exceedingly severe competition and they could only meet it by trying their very utmost to reduce the cost of manufacture and distribution. "Their idea was to encourage all those associated with them in business to expend all the energy they were capable of in order that they might attain the object they had in view." The bonus arrangement is that for every one per cent. over six per cent. that the Company earn, the employees in regular employ receive one week's wages. The bonus this year, as last, was three weeks' wages.

It was stated at the meeting that in the works they had 18 different departments, each of which had to show by weekly profit and loss accounts what it was doing. This also enabled them to see how the different employees in the various

departments were turning out their work. But for three departments, owing to the severe competition and the high price of raw material, the bonus could not have been paid. With those three departments the workers had really nothing to do.

The Directors, in their generosity, decided to renew the bonus scheme for another year, and hoped the men would show their appreciation of it in the way that they should.

It is all so very simple. For twelve months the workers are to "expend all the energy they are capable of." They are to risk getting squeezed out and thrown on the capitalist scrap heap earlier than usual, with the object of getting two or three weeks' wages as a bonus at the end of the year, if trade has been sufficiently good to provide them with regular employ. The wages bill must, of course, be kept down, and in busy times the men must work sufficiently hard to keep the unemployed at the gate. At the end of twelve months they may succeed in adding a shilling or so a week to their wages for the whole year, at the expense of a few years of their lives, and, on the other hand, having slaved hard all the year, circumstances over which they have no control, unfavourable markets, competition, and bad management, may prevent profits reaching the necessary percentage, and the reward after all the slaving is—a lecture.

Sir W. B. Forwood, presiding at the half-yearly meeting of the Liverpool Overhead Railway, gave as one of the reasons for the present unfortunate state of the concern, the concentration of ships and steamers into few hands. The result of this was, he said, that instead of a large number of individual owners, each of whom employed his own stevedore and gang of men, steamers were now worked by staffs attached to a particular dock, and not only was it not necessary for these men to make use of the railway, but a further trouble was that the increasing adoption of mechanical means for loading and unloading vessels had very largely reduced the number of hands employed.

Economic evolution is the term applied by Socialists to this concentration of capital into fewer hands, the extension and adoption of mechanical appliances, the sub-division of labour, etc. If some of those who are groping about to discover why there is an unemployed problem would study this economic trend they might be enlightened somewhat.

Last month, for the first time in the history of the Port of London, a cargo of tea was discharged by electricity. On August 1st the "Huntsman," of the Harrison Line, laden with tea from Calcutta, was unloaded by a system of continuous rollers worked by electricity. The chests were placed on the rollers and conveyed from the ship's hold to the storage shed, without intervention by men or the existing hydraulic machinery. The new process obviates breakages of the chests, hitherto very numerous, and reduces the number of men employed.

It is such instances of economic evolution which justify the attitude of the S.P.G.B. to the reform parties. They prove "The Futility of Reform."

Mr. Edward Tregear, Secretary for Labour, Department of Labour, New Zealand, writing under date Dec. 14, 1905, said, "Every advantage in wages, etc., gained for the workers by arbitration is being exploited and neutralised by robber rents."

It is a far cry from New Zealand to Woolwich, and yet Lord Goschen, a Tory Cabinet minister, declared in the House that whenever the wages of the Arsenal workmen had been raised the landlords had raised rents and left the working class as before.

It is impossible to get out of the vicious circle of capitalism, excepting by the complete abolition of the capitalist system.

J. KAY.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

DO THE WORKERS LIVE ON THE VERGE OF STARVATION?

Much discussion has been evoked at one time or another as to the statement alleged to have been made by Sir H. Campbell Bannerman that twelve millions of the population of Britain were living on the verge of starvation. To many people the important question has been as to whether the afore-mentioned individual made or did not make the assertion substantially given above. In all the discussions I have heard on the subject the question has never arisen whether the statement, whether made or not, was true in substance or in fact.

To the Socialist the matter is one of vital interest. Half a century ago Karl Marx, after a close and searching examination of the conditions of English industry, arrived at the theoretic position that so long as the present basis of industrialism—the capitalist, privately-owned property basis—existed, for so long would the wages of the worker be determined by the cost of his subsistence, that is, by the barest amount necessary for maintaining the worker and his family. This theory arrived at by deducing from the basic laws of capitalist production, he verified it by a careful review of the conditions of the workers as found in practice and as described in the reports of Royal Commissions appointed to enquire into such conditions.

True as the theory of a bare subsistence wage was found to be some sixty years ago so to-day is it true that the wage of the worker is similarly governed. An exhaustive analysis of present day conditions is not necessary to satisfy us as to the truth of this but for the benefit of some who may not have sifted the evidence for themselves, a few pointers may be useful in showing where the evidence may be found.

A good many years have now elapsed since Mr. Charles Booth set himself the task of exposing the "wild" statements of the Socialist as to the poverty of the workers. The result of his work is shown in his "Life and Labour of the People of London," a remarkable indictment of our vaunted civilisation. The figures he gave of the poverty of the London workers showed that the statements of the Socialist were not an exaggeration but an understatement of the position. 1,300,000 of the population of London, or over 30 per cent. of the people of the richest mother-city in the world, were receiving a wage of less than a guinea a week!

A guinea a week was the mark at which he had drawn his poverty line, and there were in London thirteen hundred thousand people below that poverty line. Assuming that this rate of poverty ruled throughout the whole of the United Kingdom we should, taking the population figures of 1901, have 30 per cent. of a population of 41,600,000 living under the poverty line adopted by Mr. Booth. Thirty per cent. of 41,600,000! 12,480,000!! What a picture of misery, of degradation may be conjured up by a contemplation of these figures!!!

It was, however, always open to critics to contend that owing to London's premier position men and women were more likely to drift thither than to other towns, and that in any event, in the rural districts, such a rate of poverty must be impossible. Unfortunately for this contention, it was not in accordance with the facts, and subsequent investigation has proved that what obtains in London obtains likewise in rural villages like Egremont, and in small provincial towns like York.

With Egremont I do not intend to deal, and I shall also pass over investigations into similar and subsidiary poverty problems in other towns. But with regard to York I may be permitted to write at somewhat greater length.

In the Autumn of 1899, which was a period of comparative prosperity, Mr. Seelohm Rowntree conducted a house to house investigation into the conditions of working-class families in York. The results he arrived at were published for him by Messrs. Macmillan & Co. in a book called "Poverty. A Study of Town Life." From this it appears that in York in 1899 "families comprising 20,302 persons, equal to 43.4 per cent. of the wage-earning class, and to 27.84 per cent. of the total population of the city, were living in poverty," and Mr. Rowntree sums up by saying that the fact that nearly 30 per cent. of the population are found to be living in poverty is of the gravest significance.

30 per cent. of the population in York. 30 per cent. of the population in London. Truly remarkable the way in which the results of capitalism are uniformly displayed. At page 133 he explains that the poverty of unskilled labour is due to low wages. I believe I have formerly quoted the following remarkable passage but it bears repetition:—

"It is thus seen that the wages paid for unskilled labour in York are insufficient to provide food, shelter, and clothing adequate to maintain a family of moderate size in a state of bare physical efficiency. It will be remembered that the above estimates of necessary minimum expenditure are based upon the assumption that the diet is even less generous than that allowed to able-bodied paupers in the York Workhouse, and that no allowance is made for any expenditure other than that absolutely required for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency."

And let us clearly understand what "merely physical efficiency" means. A family living upon the scale allowed for in this estimate must never spend a penny on railway fare or omnibus. They must never go into the country unless they walk. They must never purchase a half-penny newspaper or spend a penny to buy a ticket for a popular concert. They must write no letters to absent children, for they cannot afford the postage. They must never contribute anything to their church or chapel, or give any help to a neighbour which costs them money. They cannot save, nor can they join sick club or Trade Union, because they cannot pay the necessary subscriptions. The children must have no pocket money for dolls, marbles, or sweets. The father must smoke no tobacco, and must drink no beer. The mother must never buy any pretty clothes for herself or for her children, the character of the family wardrobe as for the family diet being governed by the regulation, "Nothing must be bought but that which is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of physical health, and what is bought must be of the plainest and most economical description." Should a child fall ill it must be attended by the parish doctor; should it die, it must be buried by the parish. Finally, the wage-earner must never be absent from his work for a single day.

"If any of these conditions are broken, the extra expenditure involved is met, and can only be met, by limiting the diet; or, in other words, by sacrificing physical efficiency."

"That few York labourers receiving 20/- or 21/- per week submit to these iron conditions in order to maintain physical efficiency is obvious. And even were they to submit, physical efficiency would be unattainable for those who had three or more children dependent upon them. It cannot therefore be too clearly understood, nor too emphatically repeated, that whenever a worker having three children dependent on him, and receiving not more than 21s. 8d. per week, indulges in any expenditure beyond that required for the barest physical needs, he can do so only at the cost of his own physical efficiency, or of that of some members of his family." The italics in all cases are Mr. Rowntree's.

In face of these statements we can only conclude that there is more than sufficient evidence to show that at least twelve millions of our people are living below the poverty line, and that those living on the poverty line are on the verge of starvation. Nor is this all. Those who to-day are above the poverty line may to-morrow be below and vice versa. The conditions persist though the persons vary. Says J. A. Hobson

"Only three out of every ten persons in the richest country in Europe belong to a class which is able to live in decent comfort . . . the other seven are of necessity confined to a standard of life, little, if at all, above the line of bare necessity."

The persons differ. Again I quote from "Poverty." "The life of a labourer is marked by five alternating periods of want and comparative plenty. During early childhood, unless his father is a skilled worker he probably will be in poverty; this will last until he, or some of his brothers or sisters, begin to earn money and thus augment their father's wage sufficiently to raise the family above the poverty line. Then follows the period during which he is earning money and living under his parents' roof; for some portion of this period he will be earning more money than is required for lodging, food, and clothes. This is his chance to save money. If he has saved enough to pay for furnishing a cottage, this period of comparative prosperity may continue after marriage until he has two or three children, when poverty will again overtake him. This period of poverty will last perhaps for ten years, i.e., until the first child is fourteen years old and begins to earn wages, but if there are more than three children it may last longer. While the children are earning, and before they leave the home to marry, the man enjoys another period of prosperity—possibly, however, only to sink back again into poverty when his children have married and left him, and he himself is too old to work, for his income has never permitted his saving enough for him and his wife to live upon for more than a very short time."

"A labourer is thus in poverty, and therefore underfed"

- In childhood—when his constitution is being built up.
- In early middle life—when he should be in his prime.
- In old age."

It thus appears that the number of the workers at some time or other below the poverty line is not confined to 43 per cent. It is true that this is the number at any one time. But the individuals at present below will to-morrow be above and their places will be occupied by others of their class. But the "aboves" and the "belows" cancel one another and we thus derive the result that the normal condition of the working class is to exist on the poverty line. The worker has absolutely no guarantee that he will escape from the position of having to receive less than is necessary to maintain him in a state of merely physical efficiency.

The reason for this condition of things is that he must sell his labour-power in "free" competition with his fellows in an ever overstocked labour market. Hence no reform can do anything for him. The only remedy is to abolish the present method of private property-holding, the operation of which can be shown as the cause of the overstocked labour market with its necessary corollary of a subsistence wage. This abolition would be no mere destructive policy, but would be the preliminary to a system of common property holding, the end of which would be care of all and not the aggrandisement of a few.

I think, therefore, that there can be little doubt that the statement that twelve millions of our population are on the verge of starvation is an understatement of the case, and that if this were clearly recognised to be the result of capitalism there would be a more speedy growth of a Socialist Party in this country than at present seems probable.

Be that as it may the struggle has commenced, and to those who have studied the question there cannot be any doubt that victory lies with the working class and with Socialism.

ECONOMICS.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary or from the Head Office of the Party, 28, Cursitor Street, E.C.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.

SATURDAY, SEP. 1, 1906.



THE TRADE UNION CONGRESS.

The so-called "Parliament of Labour" that will take place during the week following the publication of this number, will be larger than ever according to the statement of the Liberal M.P. who is its secretary. The usual resolutions which have been moved every year are to be moved yet again, amid the usual clamour of self-advertisement. In point of futile resolutions and wasted words the Congress compares unfavourably with even the tower of Babel at Westminster.

A Congress that is supposed to represent and express the aspirations of over a million and a half of working men should (it would seem) enunciate a definite and logical working class policy; it should break down the barriers between union and union and bring about the economic unity of the workers, and should be itself to the fore energetically and unequivocally battling for the interests of the toilers against the class who prey upon them. But the Congress does none of these things. It is rather in the position of the poultry in William Morris's fable, who spent their time discussing with what sauce they should be eaten, and who sent in resolutions and deputations to the farmer's wife and the head poultryer regarding this vital question, but who were horrified at the revolutionary suggestion of a battered looking and middle aged barn-door cock that he did not want to be eaten at all.

The aimless resolutions that are passed by the Congress in the intervals of junketing, the deputations and petitions that are sent to the class in power regarding the weight and shape of the shackles that are worn by the workers, the praise and advertisement that are given to the assembled delegates by the enemies of the working class, all demonstrate the uselessness and impotence of the Trade Union Congress. The reason for this impotence is, however, not difficult to find, and it illustrates the supreme importance of the work that we are doing—the propagation of the principles of scientific Socialism to the workers who are within and without the trade unions. The Congress is impotent because the majority of the workers within the unions are as ignorant of their real interests and as blind to their historic mission as are those who are contemptuously dubbed "black-legs". And the leaders of the blind—even those who see clearly—have in the main no desire to awaken their followers to their class position and rightful aim; they have little desire to break down sectional divisions and

ignorant prejudice among the rank and file; for if the workers were brought together as a class upon the economic field, if the workers became aware of the meaning and importance of the class struggle, and consciously pursued their revolutionary aim of the conquest of political power and the democratic control of industry, why then many of the leaders would lose their soft jobs, and many would have to abandon once and for all their hope of attaining to the flesh pots in the gift of capitalism.

CAMPING OUT.

It has been popular with a section of the unemployed this summer to try the simple life by camping out on vacant land, and, though the rôle of leaders of fashion goes oddly with the desperate efforts of the unemployed to avoid starvation, who knows but that their action may have some connection with the fact that (according to a contemporary) "Society"—another section of the unemployed—is going into camp next summer, and would this year were not the season so far advanced? However that may be, it is certain that the unfortunate unemployed have had more serious business in hand, for, in addition to calling public attention to their existence and exciting the sympathy of the charitably disposed, they have been led to believe that it was only necessary to tickle the surface of the land to bring forth abundance. Unfortunately for them, eviction has followed eviction, and the sickly lettuce and despondent cabbage have been left to their fate as camp after camp has "fizzled out."

It has been said that, although the camps have not been of long duration, nevertheless they have achieved their purpose of calling the attention of the public to the problem which awaits solution. We would point out that whatever truth or worth there may be in this is entirely discounted by the fact that these camps of unemployed call into notice at the same time a manner of dealing with unemployment that is utterly futile and indeed even harmful to the workers themselves. To seize upon land which has been left waste (precisely because it does not under present conditions pay for cultivation) and to endeavour with unskilled labour and without the machinery and stock which are essential to success, to inaugurate a "back to the land" crusade by precept and practice, is surely the height of folly. Even without the interference of the powers that be the camps could not possibly have lived.

It is, perhaps, a pity that the camps were not allowed to die a natural death, so that the "back to the land" pill for the disease of unemployment may have been used by the unemployed on such a scale that even its pseudo-Socialist advocates were forced to recognise that the only remedy for the unemployed evil is the abolition of capitalism.

THE BURWELL EXPERIMENT.

In spite of the highly coloured reports of its advocates it is now plain that the "small holding" spells enduring toil and penury to its victim. Though he slave night and day the small cultivator is in general utterly unable to compete with the superior machinery and organisation on the large farms. We have statistics before us which show the decrease in the number of small farms of from one to five acres in this country to be 6½ per cent. during the past decade, whilst there is an increase in the number of farms comprising from 300 to 500 acres. The reason for this is surely not far to seek. On the large farm there is the economy that is born of associated labour as against the isolated efforts of the petty farmer. There is also the important saving of labour due to specialisation as opposed to the all-round and ever changing activities of the small cultivator, whilst the saving of freight charges by the expedition of produce in bulk, and the utilisation of by-products, greatly increases the economy of farming on a large scale. But it is in the greater capital of the large farm, the expensive machines which enable so much to be done with so little expenditure of labour, it is in this that is to be found the reason for the squeezing out of the small producer, who cannot afford to buy, or whose land is too small to profitably employ, these great labour-saving devices. In the purchase

of stock and in command of the produce market, the larger man continually overreaches his smaller competitor; yet it is sought by many to stem the decline of agriculture by the creation of a class of peasant farmers. To do so is to condemn such men to a life of continued and arduous labour and of pinching poverty until the inevitable foreclosure of the equally inevitable mortgage.

The estate in the parish of Burwell, between Newmarket and Cambridge, for which the Crown was unable to find a tenant during the past two years, having been taken over by Mr. Rose, M.P. for the purpose, will be let out into small holdings in spite of local opposition, and once more the tragedy is to be renewed. Bounded in their vision by their own immediate interests, the middle class are unable to gauge the economic trend, and will, in spite of all evidence, endeavour to perpetuate a system of farming that is suited to conditions long past. Like the small manufacturer and shopkeeper among his middle-class confreres the small farmer is being crushed between the upper and nether millstones of the great capitalists and the proletariat. Well may we hear the bitter cry of the middle classes, for the expropriation of the middle class, whether small farmer or small manufacturer, keeps pace with the expropriation of the labourer by the machine. The middle class is economically doomed, and the future lies between the working class and the giants of capital. Thus is the class struggle made clearer.

ANOTHER PILL FOR THE EARTHQUAKE.

The hardly annual of Compulsory Arbitration makes another appearance at the Liverpool Trades Congress. Mr. Ben Tillet, of emigration notoriety, writing in *Reynolds* on the subject of the Industrial Arbitration resolution, claims that it will abolish sweating, reduce the hours of labour and assure a living wage, also that, in regard to unemployment, the "Arbitration Courts are the only useful method of dealing with the problem." Truly, of the quacking of quacks there is no end. It should be noted that it is in support of the candidature of this man that the S.D.F. have issued an appeal to their branches in the Eccles Division.

The reports which reach this country from those colonies that have adopted Compulsory Arbitration in labour disputes are most conflicting, and by no means convey the impression that the workmen are all pleased with the working of the Acts, whilst it is reported, significantly enough, that in many cases the employers are strongly in their favour. It is moreover abundantly clear that they have not abolished sweating, whilst the problem of unemployment is as acute where the Acts are in operation as it is in other capitalist countries.

The effect of the Arbitration laws, even under the most favourable conditions, must be to hasten the development of machinery and to cause a further speeding up of the workman, whilst those who are below a given standard cease to be employed at all. Thus the tendency of this trade-union cure-all is to still further swell the unemployed and, moreover, to prevent the workers by means of these sacred awards or contracts from reaping any advantage from sound organisation, or during a period of good trade. The men are tied hand and foot, and are compelled under penalty to wait until the expiration of the award (which probably happens at the worst moment for the labourer,) before making any effort to improve their lot.

The resolution before the Liverpool Congress reads in part, "The Court shall determine a minimum wage, and shall have power to punish any infringement of awards by fine, imprisonment and payment of compensation to the victimised worker." It is also stipulated that the Courts shall be constituted by an equal number of workmen and employers' representatives, and that where not mutually agreed upon the Labour Department of the State shall appoint chairman or referee. The resolution, let it be remembered, also expressly limits the application of the proposed arbitration law to the members of those trade unions affiliated to the Trade Union Congress.

We know the astuteness of those employers' representatives with their life-long training in

driving a hard bargain, and we fear for the integrity of even the most steadfast of the men's representatives when exposed to the temptations they must meet from the employers in those Courts. Obviously, the man who favours such a resolution can be no Socialist; he cannot be aware that there is an irreconcilable antagonism of interests between the master class and the working class, and that in the waging of this struggle for emancipation there can be no truce or the workers lose.

The mere fact that a man sincerely supports such a resolution which pretends to ask a capitalist government to legislate on behalf of the workers, and to legislate in such a way that the victim must arbitrate with the brigand about the share he may have of his own product, and to arbitrate, above all, in such manner that the casting vote is always in the hands of the enemy with power to enforce his commands by fine and imprisonment, the mere fact that a man supports such a resolution stamps him as one ignorant of the very fundamental principles of working-class politics.

REVOLUTION NOT REFORM.

We are soldiers of the Social Revolution. No reform can bring any economic benefit to the whole working class. Do you think Municipal Ownership will abolish poverty? If you do, read any recent description of the slums of Glasgow, where Municipal Ownership has been carried farther than any American reformer has yet proposed.

Revolution tears an evil up by its roots; reform merely shifts it from one spot to another. When New York demolished its "Little Italy," and put a park in its place, what happened? Rents in the vicinity rose to a point that drove out all the former inhabitants, and a new, and, if possible, worse Little Italy came into being further up town. Do you think a reform like that is worthy the efforts of a workingman, not a mere dilettante in philanthropy? When the Mills Hotel No. 1 was opened, within a few weeks merchants in the neighbourhood reduced wages, and when their clerks protested they could not live on the new scale, the reply came quickly: "O yes, you can. Go, live at the Mills Hotel."

Think about that for a few minutes. Do you begin to see the economic law of the matter? Here it is: Any reform that reduces the cost of living of the working class reduces to at least the same extent the wages of that class.

Many forms of Municipal Ownership may and do cheapen the cost of living, but as they also reduce wages, they can be of no benefit to the working class. Municipal Ownership may reduce the amount of corruption and graft in our city politics; but whether it does or not is no concern of the working class. If graft were abolished to-morrow, the working class would be no better off economically. The workingman is robbed "to the full extent that the traffic will bear" at the factory door. Graft simply changes the mode of division of the spoil after it has been taken from the working class. To the workingman who is merely getting his bare keep like the horse in his master's stable, it is a matter of indifference whether the wealth that he and his fellows have been robbed of is expended in the purchase of an automobile, or an alderman, a steam yacht, or a Supreme Court Judge, or in the building of an oil refinery or a railway.

Where Public Ownership is accomplished by purchase instead of by confiscation, let us see what it means. The only way a City can get the money to purchase a street railway, a water works, or a gas plant is—generally speaking—by issuing bonds. These bonds are desirable investments for the perishing Middle Class who are being driven from every other field by the captains of industry and finance. These bondholders are just as truly the owners of the municipalized plants as are the present private owners. But they have a distinct advantage. The security of their investment and the payment of their interest is guaranteed by the City Government. We still have private, not public ownership. The difference is that the City Government has now become the managing and collecting agent of the owners.

Is this "reform" enough of a change for you to fight for? You damn it, when you call it a reform. No reform can help you. What you need is a revolution.

True public ownership cannot be allowed, save by confiscation. This sort of public ownership would help you, because it would precipitate the Social Revolution. Why? Because no one class of your masters, your robbers, your exploiters would consent to be stripped of their stolen goods, their means of exploitation, without compensation, while their fellows retained theirs.

Has "confiscation" an ugly sound to you, my non-socialist reader? So it has to me, and that is just why I am a Socialist. At present four-fifths of the product of the toil of the working class is confiscated by the master class, and the object of the Socialist movement is to end for ever this hideous confiscation; but I for one do not propose to pay the thieves or the fences one penny for the goods they have "confiscated"—stolen from the workers.

Compensation? Yes, they will receive ample compensation in the privilege and joy of living in a world of equals, where poverty and misery will be unknown, and fellowship will be a living fact, and not an empty word. Can you conceive of any greater compensation than this? I can not.

ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE,
in *Progress* (New York).

THE MACHINE IN AGRICULTURE.

By L. H. ROBLIN, Député de la Nièvre.

The formidable crisis which accompanied the introduction of machinery into industry at the beginning of last century, is well known. From day to day thousands of workmen were thrown out of work upon the pavement of the towns, without money and without bread. As the factory chimneys rose, as the progress resulting from the successive efforts of past generations, replaced the less docile, less rapid and more costly hand of man in the daily labour by the brutal strength of steam and electricity, cries of poverty and anguish came from the breasts of the workmen violently expropriated from their living, hunted from the workshops by the discoveries of science, by the onward march of mankind. It is remembered to what extremities misery forced the crowds of famished men, who threw themselves upon and broke into pieces the machines which had been substituted for them.

The same events which happened nearly a hundred years ago in industry are being repeated to-day in agriculture. Machinery is being introduced everywhere in our fields. The consequence of this new state of things, if it does not end as formerly in violence of the worst kind, is nevertheless most important and most dangerous to social life.

It is not only from to-day, however, that the machine has made its appearance in agriculture: twenty-five or thirty years ago the use of the steam threshing machine became general and replaced (by the aid of the traction engine which takes it from farm to farm) the antiquated threshing with the flail on the barn floor which occupied an entire staff of workers on all important farms during the whole of the winter. This transformation, however, was hardly felt because it occurred at a time when agriculture was at the height of its prosperity, when cultivators had not yet passed that crisis which has weighed upon them for so long a time and has caused them to modify more or less completely their old manner of life and ancient customs.

During the agricultural crisis the landowners and farmers have been led to cut down expenses, and they have sought to restrict in particular that item which costs most the labourer. Wherever possible they have abandoned the culture of cereals in favour of meadow and pasture for which practically no labour is required. It is indeed to be remarked that cattle raising has never suffered so much from market depression as the production of wheat, oats or rye. In many districts to-day only sufficient corn is sown to provide the straw necessary for wintering the cattle.

Cultivation, which was the great occupation

of the rural population in former times, is much restricted to-day. Enforced idleness exists during a considerable portion of the year: indeed, scarcely, except at the times of haying and harvesting, is the agricultural labourer sure of finding work. During these two periods of hard labour, the peasants, in several countries, have sought to earn more than in the past in order to compensate by a temporary but suitable wage for the long days of unemployment that they suffer during the winter and autumn. Conflicts, declared or veiled, have arisen recently between farmers and labourers, and they become each day more and more numerous. In order to oppose the demands of the labourers the masters shake before them the spectre of the machine. "If you create difficulties for us," they say, "we will purchase machines. Then you will have no more work and you will earn nothing. It is preferable for you that you accept what we propose, even though you find it insufficient."

A large number of farmers have passed from threats to acts. With the openly avowed aim of undermining the least manifestation of energy and combination among the agricultural labourers, they have purchased mowers, patent rakes and self binders, which enable them with an extremely reduced staff to take in their crops in a few days.

The development of machinery in our fields became generally noticeable four or five years ago, and it grows more and more in importance as rural knowledge becomes awakened. It is the direct reply of the exploiters to the demands of the exploited. It must also be remembered that the employers have been helped by recent improvements in agricultural machinery. Formerly the machines consisted only of a few parts, and when one of these was put out of action during operations (by the shock of a stone for instance) it was necessary to stop work and wait a considerable time for an urgent repair. At the present time, however, the new American machines are composed of many interchangeable parts, and when one of them is put out of truth or broken it is only necessary to unscrew a bolt and replace the part on the spot. The interruption of work is scarcely noticeable.

These various reasons are the cause that, this year in particular, complete train loads of harvesting machinery were to be met with in the stations of all agricultural districts. Everywhere, from every side, the agricultural labourer saw hitherto unknown machines arrive in the fields to displace him, and a dark anger takes possession of him as he sees these machines progressing and working by means of which it is designed to starve him into submission.

There have as yet been no acts of violence or grave and general disorders; nevertheless it sometimes happens, in the shadow of the hedge and under cover of night, that a machine left in the fields is destroyed.

As immediate consequence, the advent of machinery will hasten still more the exodus of the inhabitants of our hamlets and villages toward the towns. The periods of unemployment already so terrible will become intolerable, and the able-bodied of our country proletariat will be compelled to fly toward other destinies, to go into the great centres of population to find again the same poverty that they will have left behind in their cottages.

It is always said that "agriculture is short of hands." No. It is agriculture that no longer employs the hands which are at its disposal. The rural proletariat in the literal sense of the word is no longer able to live. The advent of machinery has given it the final blow; so true is it that, under capitalism, the most useful discoveries, the most remarkable inventions, every progress of science, if they profit a few, are nevertheless for the others the victims a cause of poverty and ruin. *L'Action*. (Translated by F.C.W.)

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND TRADE UNIONISM.

[All Resolutions adopted during the course of this discussion have to be referred to the Party Membership through the Branches for ratification or otherwise. The decision of the Party will be published after the full Report of the Debate has appeared.]

[Continued from August issue.]

Fitzgerald said he was sorry Jackson had moved this amendment because the substance of it was contained in a resolution he intended to move. He opposed the resolution because it contained "terminological inexactitudes" and committed the movers of it to a position which he thought they perhaps did not understand. Because he contended that if the class principle was to be first it was contradictory to say the industrial was not non-sectional. The word "industrial" gave certain impressions in certain directions. The man in the street would have the idea that it was something different from the ordinary Trade Unions. But to the Socialist the word "industrial" conveyed something distinct. It conveyed I.W.W. The members of the Party who met to form an I.W.W. club during the week went there either to form a club to propagate Industrial Unionism or they went there as deliberate frauds. He would read the call:—

LONDON NEXT.

Following on the resolution passed at the S.L.P. Annual Conference, April 15th, endorsing Industrial Unionism and pledging our membership to set up clubs for the spread of Industrial Union principles, several members of the London S.L.P. and of the S.P.G.B. have decided to call together a meeting to the end of formally constituting such a club. The meeting will be held at the Communist Club, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, W. on the evening of May the 10th at 8 p.m. Sympathisers of whatever political party are invited to attend and assist in the formation of a revolutionary economic organisation.—*Socialist, May, 1906.*

The call fairly and squarely was to those who sympathised with the resolution of the Annual Conference of the S.L.P. on the I.W.W. The resolution referred to in the call was:—

Considering that the task of emancipating the workers demands economic organisation as well as political, the Socialist Labour Party endorses the new international union known as the Industrial Workers of the World and urges the members and adherents of the Party everywhere to set up clubs for the spread of Industrial Union principles as a preliminary to the definite establishment of the I.W.W. in Great Britain.—*Socialist, May, 1906.*

Leigh, interposing, said that at the meeting at the Communist Club an entirely different resolution was put.

Fitzgerald said they had to examine their position in regard to the organisation known as the I.W.W. A certain preamble was laid down in the constitution of that organisation which they were told was revolutionary. The question was raised at the last meeting whether this preamble did not denote a revolutionary organisation. He said, no. What were the constituents of the I.W.W.? First, the Western Federation of Miners. He read from the stenographic report of the Chicago Convention which said:—

I am . . . a member of the Western Federation of Miners, a revolutionary industrial labor organisation. We have not got an agreement existing with any mine manager, superintendent or operator at the present time. (Page 154.)

But the I.W.W. had agreements with certain people: Haywood said, "We are a revolutionary organisation," yet in the industrial war in Colorado the Western Federation of Miners asked its members to vote for capitalist candidates after lessons against which Featherstone was child's play. And the W.F. of M. formed the backbone of the I.W.W. They therefore had a rank and file not understanding Socialism adopting a Socialist preamble. They claimed that the L.R.C., although it had certain members Socialist, and had passed a resolution in favour of the Socialisation of production, was to be opposed. They had again from the stenographic report the following statement by Delegate Klemensic:—

We must not overlook the fact that we are here as working men, and as such we do not recognise the Socialist, the Anarchist, or any other kind of "ist." (Page 232.)

At that conference De Leon and others, all

members of the S.L.P. and the S.T. & L.A., were present, and not a single one got up to deny that statement. Another man, Delegate Murtagh, said, referring to a clause in the Preamble:—

I think that this clause is just exactly the thing, and is born of exactly the same need that the old live trade unions mean when they say "no politics in the union." . . . It is useless for us here to attempt to disguise the fact that we have every shade of political opinion. We have the Socialists—I happen to be one of them—who believe that action in the political line is absolutely necessary. We have the Socialist on the other hand, who is so near the Anarchist that he is beginning to think as the Anarchist does, that action along the political line is absolutely harmful instead of being useful. (Page 228.)

Now several people had made an attempt to explain that. They could not do it, but had to talk about something that might occur in the future. That is what Murtagh did. Another delegate, Clarence Smith, said:—

It seems to me that this paragraph of the Preamble particularly is intended, not to represent the Principles and purposes of Industrialism, but represents a toadyism to three different factions in this convention. (Applause.) . . . It seems to me that this paragraph could not have been more involved or more confusing if it had been written by the platform committee of the Republican or Democratic party. . . . It seems to me that this paragraph is intended to be such that the supporter of this movement can point to it when talking to a pure and simple unionist and say "that is just what you want and expresses what you believe in." I believe it is intended to be such that a Socialist can be pointed to this platform with the statement that "this is Socialism." I believe it is intended to be such that an Anarchist can be confronted with this platform and told that "this means Anarchy as it is written right in this paragraph." . . . I am going to talk to individuals wherever I find them for this movement, and I cannot afford to have Bro. De Leon along with me every time I meet a man to explain what this paragraph means. (Pages 229-230.)

As Smith said, it meant all things to all men. He hoped a lot of them had read "What Means this Strike." In that you had one of the clearest expositions of the Socialist attitude to an economic strike. Moreover, some of them had heard De Leon in London. He knew of no man who could put the Socialist principle simpler than De Leon. It could not be said he did not understand the position. Then why did he attempt to wangle round the Preamble of the I.W.W. when he said:—

I know not a single exception of any party candidate ever elected upon a political platform of the emancipation of the working class who did not sell them out as fast as elected (Applause). Now it may be asked, "that being so, why not abolish altogether the political movement? Why at all unite the workers on the political field?" The aspiration to unite the workers upon the political field is an aspiration in line and step with civilisation. Civilised man, when he argues with an adversary, does not start with clenching his fist and telling him, "smell this bunch of bones." . . . He begins by arguing: physical force by arms is the last resort. Civilised man . . . will always give a chance to peace. But civilised man, unless he is a visionary, will know that unless there is might behind your Right, your Right is something to laugh at. And the thing to do, consequently, is to gather behind that ballot, behind that united political movement, the might which is alone able when necessary to "take and hold." Without the working people are united on the political field, without the delusion has been removed from their minds that any of the issues of the capitalist class can do for them anything permanently, or even temporarily; without the working people have been removed altogether from the mental thralldom of the capitalist class, from its insidious influence, there is no possibility of your having those conditions under which they can really organise themselves economically in such a way as to "take and hold." (Page 227.)

For sixteen years the S.L.P. had been endeavouring to get on all the ballots on a revolutionary basis. Now we come to the statement that any man elected on that basis would be a suspicious character. That was the fact of the situation.

He said:—

If any individual is elected upon a revolutionary ballot, that individual is a suspicious character. (Applause). Whoever is returned elected to office on a program of labour emancipation; whoever is allowed to be filtered through by the political election inspectors of the capitalist class, that man is a carefully selected tool, a traitor of the working people, selected by the capitalist class. (Page 226.)

In other words he used the same argument as Jack Williams used to E. J. B. Allen in connection with the unemployed—that it was necessary to go to the Government and ask for something to find that you would not get it! We fight for control of political power because the armed forces of the capitalist class were controlled by the political party. It was a fallacy that an industrial organisation could take and hold anything which the capitalist would not allow you. They could blow you out of existence when they liked while they controlled those forces. He opposed the resolution.

Phillips said he rose to oppose both the resolution and the amendment. He thought Fitzgerald was wrong when he said that the man who went to the I.W.W. meeting and did not take a part in it was a fraud. He (Phillips) went with the idea of seeing that the organisation had a sound political basis and a sound economic expression. He took up the same position with regard to the resolution as he took up towards the I.W.W. They were bound to fight existing Trade Unions and organise the workers on the economic field but he did not think the Bexley resolution good enough because it would allow the members of the economic organisation proposed, to "monkey" on the political field. Upon the political as well as on the economic they should have sound organisations supporting one another, and they should not allow any members to in any way support Capitalism on either field. He did not think a case had been made out for the doctrine of "permeation." Therefore they had to organise the workers in an economic organisation to which they could point the members of the political party. He believed, however, that the rank and file of the S.L.P. and of the S.P.G.B. were honest and consistent Socialists and that neither organisation had departed from the principles of revolutionary Socialism. The only point was that the S.L.P. had endorsed an organisation which would allow its members to take any action they liked on the political field. He claimed that when members of the S.P.G.B. joined with members of the S.L.P. to form an economic organisation without a clear political expression they were not holding correctly to their principles. But while the S.P.G.B. allowed its members to belong to unsound economic organisations like Trade Unions the Party itself was unsound.

A. W. Pearson said during the week he had picked up a copy of the *Weekly People* in which De Leon points out that the S.L.P. in America should dominate the S.T. and L.A., or the economic organisation. The economic organisation should now, however, dominate the S.L.P., yet the I.W.W. will accept any brand of politics. He supposed a member of the working class would come to an I.W.W. meeting and ask what political party he should join. Then they would have the members of all the political parties shouting at once and claiming that their party was the only one. Leigh was speaking about members of the S.L.P. being quite willing to throw over their leaders. The S.D.F. and I.L.P. members were also saying they only needed unity conventions of the rank and file to effect unity. The S.L.P. only existed in Scotland because the S.P.G.B. was not there. It was already dead in London. If they were going to have a Trade Union let them have one affiliated to the Party. They did not want men in a Trade Union under false pretences—men who would accept a preamble said to be Socialism but who were class-unconscious. At the bottom of the I.W.W. business was merely the old anarchist principle.

E. J. B. Allen said he noticed Fitzgerald laid great stress on what the I.W.W. delegates had said at its convention. If they were going to take the speeches of any individual delegate they could make a great deal out of any convention. Trouble had been made because there had been an economic organisation established without affiliation to a political party and he maintained that the Socialist organisation could

be formed without affiliation. The I.W.W. Propaganda Society was formed to propagate what they believed to be correct. Let them look at the so called contradictory statement of the I.W.W. Preamble. The party that stated "until they come together on the political field" could not be an anarchist organisation. He had never said that it was not necessary to capture the political machinery. How were they going to take and hold the means of production? He had always held that it was impossible until the political power of the capitalist class was smashed. When the political power of the capitalist class was smashed they would no longer have use for it. Last Wednesday five-and-twenty men decided to start a propagandist organisation. Did that look like seeking after big numbers? When at the first conference of the S.P.G.B. he moved the resolution to establish a Socialist Union when sufficient members had joined he did not get a seconder. There were men who saw that a political party not the expression of a sound economic organisation could never make any progress. The workers had to be drilled with an understanding of their economic position, and the best way of getting them to recognise their class interest was to organise them on that field where they came every day in direct conflict with the capitalist class. The propertyless class interest of the worker could only be reflected in the politics of Socialism. Till the workers were united on the economic field as a whole they would have several types of so-called Socialist parties. The organisation of the present political State was a direct negation of the organisation which would prevail under Socialism. Therefore it was necessary to organise them on that basis. Men who may come into an industrial organisation, even if they were ignorant, could not but come to have a clear expression of their economic class interest. Educational work could be done effectively from an economic organisation. A political party not backed up by an economic organisation was trying to rush ahead faster than the rest of the working class. If they had these various political parties fighting one another and claiming to be Socialist they could do nothing until they had a sound economic organisation of the working class. The Socialist Republic had got to live on its economic foundation, and until they had a political party representing an economic organisation their efforts would be futile. While claiming that they should continue their political propaganda, they should have a sound industrial organisation. He claimed they had a Socialist union even if it was not affiliated to the S.P.G.B. Whilst the S.P.G.B. may be claimed to be the only sound organisation it was another thing to claim that there were no sound Socialists outside that organisation. There were men in the S.D.F. to-day still trying to pull the S.D.F. straight. Had we the greater interest of the S.P.G.B. before us or the interest of the working class? If there were S.D.F. members saying and advocating that the only sound principle was that of uncompromising hostility to the whole of the capitalist class at all times there was no reason why they should not work with them. He would say to these men, are you in favour of an economic organisation based on the class struggle and aiming at the overthrow of the capitalist system? And there were such men. He was willing to unite on that basis with any man with honest principles, believing that men in a straight economic organisation could not but take straight political action. If they said the unions must take up the Socialist position what organisation must be offered to them instead of the present unions?

Anderson asked whether Allen knew that the only parts on the Continent where the Socialist Party had been successful was where the political party had dominated the trade unions. Allen said the political parties, as far as he knew, never ran a trade union. Jackson in reply said Allen thought it was necessary that an economic organisation should be formed for taking and holding the means of production. An economic organisation alone could take and hold nothing. The question was one of class consciousness. He did not accuse anyone of dishonesty. The point was were they mistaken or were they not? When the working class became class-conscious then such a modification of their economic organisation would take

place that the necessary correct action on both fields would be taken. The logical conclusion of the principle of the I.W.W. was Anarchism, the General Strike, and street riots. Only when the mass of the workers had been organised in a political party of the workers could sound progress be possible.

The amendment was carried by 25 to 18 and became a substantive resolution.

Here A. J. M. Gray had to leave and W. Gifford was elected to the chair.

Anderson moved to amend by substituting the words "wage workers" for "trade unionists," which was carried.

The substantive resolution as amended was then put and defeated by 20 to 13.

The discussion was adjourned.

RAILWAYS

AND THEIR RISE TO MONOPOLY.

The study of our railways is interesting and instructive in view of the rapid rise and development of this form of capitalism to monopoly.

The first railway sanctioned by Parliament, known as the Surrey Iron Railway, from Wandsworth to Croydon, was opened in 1805, under the "Iron Railway or Tram-road Act," passed in 1801, which authorised the construction of a railway for the conveyance of goods and coal. The line was open to the general use of traders and carriers, who supplied their own vehicles and horses (horse-power being the only motive power used), for which the railway company were entitled to charge tolls.

Passing over a period of a few years, during which this Act was followed by several others, we come to the "Stockton and Darlington Railway Act" of 1825 for the construction of a horse tramway. But before its completion, George Stephenson having established the value of the locomotive, application was made to Parliament in 1825 for permission to use steam-power; the Act allowing the Company to charge a toll "for every gig, landau, waggon, car, coach, chariot, chaise, cart or other carriage which shall be drawn or used on the said railways or tramroads, for the conveyance of passengers or small packages or parcels."

The "Great Western Railway Act" (1835), states "That all persons shall have free liberty to pass along and upon and to use and employ the said railway with carriages properly constructed as by this Act directed, upon payment only of such rates and tolls as shall be demanded by this said Company," etc.

Thus we see that the first idea in the construction of railways was merely the provision of another means of transit (the existing means being the roads and canals) open to the use of anyone upon payment of a toll. But it was not long before it occurred to the railway companies to be their own carriers, "to provide haulage as well as the road, and passenger carriages as well as the haulage," the general economical advantages securing the ready adoption of the new system.

A Parliamentary enquiry in 1840 resulted in the railway companies being permitted to perform all the duties of general carriers, so that in the course of forty years, from being merely the providers of the railway for the use of carriers, they combined both functions and became the general carriers themselves. Thus the seeds of monopoly were sown.

As time passed the railway companies found that while they held a monopoly with regard to traffic in which quick transport was the first consideration, they had, in the carrying of minerals, grain, timber, etc., where speed was not the prime necessity, formidable competitors in the canals, whose small maintenance and working expenses gave them the advantage (it was declared that goods could be conveyed by water at one-tenth the cost of conveyance by railway). The railway companies therefore set themselves to kill such dangerous competitors, and have succeeded to such an extent that they now control more than one-third of the canal mileage. In evidence before the Canal Committee in 1883, Mr. Condor stated that: "they have obtained their 1,717 miles (out of some 3,800 miles) of canals so adroitly selected as to strangle the

whole of the inland water traffic."

Having obtained a monopoly, and by an amalgamation among themselves to keep up rates and fares made monopoly more complete. "From every district between John O'Groats and Land's End, and from every industry and trade, come constant complaints against railway companies charging rates that are excessive, preferential, and unjust, and withholding facilities which the traders believe they have a legal right to demand. . . . There is no need to attribute to railway directors either an undue lack of patriotism, or motives uncovered by the usual commercial code. (Oh! that elastic commercial code.) They are elected and paid to serve the interests of their shareholders, and if these are not coincident with the interests of the public then they can scarcely be blamed for the antagonism. The short-comings will have to be looked for in the intrinsic character of the present system."

There is something delightfully quaint in this admission. Railway directors are elected to produce a profit, and if the interests of the public do not coincide with the interests of the companies, well—so much the worse for the public.

The cry of the commercial capitalist against the railway monopolist is but an expression of the commercial war in which one capitalist section obtains a pull over the other—and uses it. But while they compete one with the other they are united in the constant endeavour to wring an ever greater profit from the producers of wealth—the working class.

There is not the least doubt that railway rates have had a damaging effect upon British trade generally, nor, which is the important matter from the Socialist point of view, is there the least doubt that the private ownership of the means of transit (in common with the private ownership of all the other means of life), is entirely detrimental to the interests of the working class, but "these short-comings will have to be looked for in the intrinsic character of the present system."

And since these short-comings are inherent in and inseparable from the present system (of private ownership in the means of life), it follows that the remedy must be in the abolition of the present system, and the substitution of another in which all means of production and distribution (land, factories, railways, etc.) are worked by and in the interest of—not a section of the community, to the hurt of the community in general—but in the interests of the whole community.

This is the mission of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, to show the workers how they will have to effect the change, how they may emancipate themselves from the thralldom of Capitalism.

As every interest sends its representatives to the legislative bodies of the country to safeguard those interests, so must the working class send their representatives to seize the reins of political power. The working class form about seven-eighths of the population, and hold over two-thirds of the voting power. They can possess themselves of political power directly they are ready. Therefore—

"Arise, ye workers of the world,
Gird ye your loins for the strife;
For in thy power united lies,
The promise of a truer life."

W. W. HUST.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—In *The Socialist Standard* for July, Mr. Anderson states in the Debate on Trade Unionism and Socialism, "he agreed with Kautsky that the political organisation must dominate the economic." If the political forces dominate the economic forces, would Mr. Anderson have us believe that all reforms in the past have been brought about by political and not economic influences?

Can Mr. Anderson point out where one Act of Parliament for the benefit of the workers has been initiated inside the House of Commons? Are not all reforms brought about by agitation, such agitation being the result of economic pressure and not political force?

If we were to have political freedom, we should still have economic slavery. But were we to have economic freedom we should not have political slavery.

Yours faithfully,

PRINTERS' MACHINE-MINDER

Clapton, N.F.

S.P.G.B. LECTURE LIST for SEPT.

SUNDAYS.		9th.	16th.	23rd.	30th.
Battersea, Prince's Head	11.30	F. C. Watts	H. Newman	J. Crump	F. E. Dawkins
Finsbury Park	7.30	J. Kent	A. Barker	R. H. Kent	J. Humphreys
Forest Gate, Dames Road	6.0	A. Anderson	W. Gifford	A. Anderson	A. Anderson
Jolly Butchers' Hill	7.45	F. E. Dawkins	J. Fitzgerald	J. H. Kennett	W. Gifford
	11.30	G. C. H. Carter	T. W. Allen	A. Anderson	H. Newman
	7.30	J. Crump	W. Gifford	J. Crump	R. Kenny
Manor Park Broadway	11.30	W. Gifford	J. Kent	G. C. H. Carter	T. W. Allen
Paddington, Prince of Wales	11.30	H. Newman	F. E. Dawkins	J. Fitzgerald	J. Kent
Peckham Rye	11.30	W. Moriell	G. C. H. Carter	W. A. Cole	W. Killick
	6.0	H. Newman	G. C. H. Carter	F. E. Dawkins	J. Fitzgerald
Tooting Broadway	7.0	T. W. Allen	E. Fawcett	H. Newman	R. H. Kent
Tottenham, Seven Sisters C'n'r	11.30	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	J. Kent	A. Anderson
	8.0	F. E. Dawkins	A. Anderson	J. Fitzgerald	F. C. Watts
Watford Market Place	7.30	J. Fitzgerald	J. Kent	T. W. Allen	W. A. Cole
MONDAYS.		3rd.	10th.	17th.	24th.
Ilford, Railway Station	8.30	J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins	J. Kent	F. E. Dawkins
Upton Park Railway Station	8.40	W. Gifford	G. C. H. Carter	W. Gifford	G. C. H. Carter
WEDNESDAYS.		5th.	12th.	19th.	26th.
Tooting Broadway	8.30	A. Barker	H. Newman	J. Humphreys	J. McManus
THURSDAYS.		6th.	13th.	20th.	27th.
Tottenham, St. Ann's Rd.	8.30	A. Anderson	F. E. Dawkins	H. Newman	A. Anderson
SATURDAYS.		8th.	15th.	22nd.	29th.
East Ham, opposite 'Ruskin'	8.0	G. C. H. Carter	J. H. Kennett	F. E. Dawkins	W. Gifford
Harringay, 'The Salisbury'	8.0	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson	A. Anderson

**THE
SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT
BRITAIN****HOLDS**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

**THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF
TRADE UNIONS.**

I have not spilled much ink in praise of the Federation because there was nothing to praise. . . . The biggest union in the Federation, the A.S.E., is in it to-day simply and solely because its money is in it, and not because of any recognition of its value or usefulness. And this I know, that if the A.S.E. could withdraw its money, the members would be glad to be rid of their obligations. The Engineers have paid in something near a third of the Federation funds. The idea of forfeiting £40,000 or so is not pleasant. . . . It seems that there is a serious doubt in many minds regarding the wisdom of contributing more money to the support of an institution that has failed to justify its existence.

FRANK ROSE in the *Clarion*.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J.C. (Battersea).—Mr. R. Bell's speech, extensively quoted in our August issue, was fully reported in the Newcastle daily papers for July 16th. and in *The Railway Review* for July 20th.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

VOL. II

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Sept., 1905 to Aug. 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered,

Post Free 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be addressed: S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

NOW READY.**S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.****From Handicraft
to Capitalism,**

Translated from the German of

KARL KAUTSKY.

POST FREE 1½d.

S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

This Number commences VOL. III of
THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Therefore subscribe now.

— See Terms on page 4. —

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**HEAD OFFICE.**

28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—A. E. Jacomb, Sec., 85, Forest Lane, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Secretary, 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Sundays at 3.30.

FULHAM.—E. Fairbrother, Secretary, 15, Musgrove Crescent, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—Communications to the Secretary, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Mondays at 9 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road, Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Gorrings Dining Rooms, Gorrings Park Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets Mondays 8 p.m., at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road. Thos. Dicks, Secretary.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Pk. Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following:
BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.

BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.

BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.

LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnum Grove, Litherland.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Laura Rogers, 15, Wallis Avenue.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL. (Karl Marx) 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND

WAGES (Thorold Rogers) 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD

Vol. I. (Bound) 3s. 0d.

Vol. II. 3s. 0d.

Unbound Copies 1 to 12 1s. 0d.

Do. do. 13 to 24 1s. 0d.

MANIFESTO and RULES of the

S.P.G.B. 1½d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO

CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO 2½d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES' BOY 1½d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST

(Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 6½d.

ALL POST FREE.

The
Official Organ
or
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 26. Vol. 3.]

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

The Struggle for political supremacy. The tremendous efforts made by the ruling class to retain control of the political machinery when seeking the suffrages of the workers in National and Local elections, is a most significant, though generally unrecognised fact; and the millions which are spent in parliamentary, and the thousands in municipal, contests should show to the thinking man or woman the immense importance the ruling class attach to this matter. An explanation is thus demanded from those who claim to represent the interests of the class that is ruled - the working class - as to why they also are in the political field and are fighting for the control of this machinery.

Let us at once point out that the term "Political Machinery" means all those methods and arrangements which the dominant class have found it necessary to collectively control in extending and maintaining their domination over the rest of Society. The National or Parliamentary section is, of course, the most important, although, due to geographic and social divisions, local and organic subdivisions of this machinery are formed and perpetuated in the shape of County, Borough, Town, and Parish Councils, Boards of Guardians, Asylum and Education Boards. It must, however, be noted that these are after all only subdivisions, and as such are ultimately under the control and domination of Parliament. This limitation of the powers of municipal bodies needs to be clearly understood by the working class, particularly as the various so-called "reform" and "labour" parties are either ignorant of, or else deliberately conceal the fact at election times, promising all sorts of measures quite without the power of a local body while the present system lasts.

The necessity for class organisation. What must be clearly recognised by the workers is that to-day they are in the position of articles of merchandise; they are quite cut off from any access to the means of living and wealth production (Land, Machinery, Mills, Railways, etc.) except by selling themselves for such price (termed wages) as they can get upon the Labour Market. All the means of living, and the wealth therewith produced, are owned by another section in Society (the capitalist class) who perform no useful function therein, but live in idleness and luxury upon the wealth they appropriate from the workers. Wealth in all societies being the matter of the globe converted to the use of mankind by human energy, it necessarily follows that if any able-bodied individuals are living in Society without doing useful work they do so by the robbery (direct or indirect, it matters little which) of the useful workers. Between the robber and robbed there is thus a direct and complete opposition of interests.

The capitalist class, however, are able to safeguard and preserve their position only by virtue of their control of the political machinery. They thus make and administer the laws, direct the police and judicial officers, and, above all, maintain the trained armed fighting forces in the country to keep the workers under control and

to guard the capitalists' property. In other words the capitalist class know, or are conscious of, their position and interests, while the workers in the main are far from having clearly grasped the situation as it affects them. The first thing requisite on the workers' behalf is a clear recognition of the deep gulf existing between the robbed working class and the robber capitalist class, and following thereupon the application of that fact to their action in the political field by taking up a position of uncompromising hostility to all supporters of capitalism in any shape or form.

Before the workers can better their position to any material extent, they must wrest the political machinery from the hands of the capitalist class. They should, therefore, ignore the shouting of "Progressive" and "Moderate" factions, admittedly capitalist as they are, as well as the so-called "Labour" or "Socialist" candidates who urge the saving of the rates, gas, etc. for the purpose of providing safe investments for small middle-class capitals, to make sinecures for their friends and relatives, and to use the profit for reducing rates, - all of which depend upon the continued exploitation of the workers.

The task of clearing the confusion created by these bogus "labour" parties is truly Herculean, and, were it not that the wage-slaves, municipal and other, are being forced to recognise that in municipal trading they only meet their old enemy capitalist exploitation in a new guise, the task would be well nigh hopeless. But the class antagonism cannot longer be masked. Whether engaged in sweeping the roads or running the trams, whether delivering letters or making army clothing, the fact is being brought home to the workers that to-day municipalization or nationalization is not Socialism, but that on the contrary the workers have to reckon with their most powerful enemy, to wit - the capitalist class united in municipal and national government against any of the workers' demands.

The articles which have recently appeared in the columns of that Liberal advocate of municipal trading, the *Daily Chronicle*, on the strike of the Halifax municipal tramway employees, are significant of much. They speak of the coming "Labour Danger" in municipal exploitation, and evidence the determination of the ruling class that the workers shall not be any the less exploited because they happen to be employed by the municipality.

The advantages of municipalism examined. Upon closer inspection the boasted advantages of municipal or national employment are seen to dwindle: a "paper" ten hours day is in one instance found to cover sixteen hours in reality, and a few pence increase in wages is found to be really a reduction with the greater intensity of work involved. Neither does any greater security of employment exist, as the numerous "odd men" of the municipal services, and the recent wholesale discharges from government works, eloquently testify; whilst sweating in government departments is a regularly recurring scandal.

The statement that municipalization and nationalization are object lessons in Socialism, is, then, an absurdity, whilst the assertion that they lead up to complete organisation of production is hardly more true of the municipal service than it is of the huge company or trust, since the officials are similar and the methods of exploitation the same. Indeed, the fact that tramway, lighting, and other services of the municipality cannot overstep the local boundaries, is evidence that, upon those fields at any rate, a huge company or trust would in reality present a greater economic advance by embracing larger areas. Moreover, the workers will have to fight as hard to gain control of municipal or national industries, as they will to gain control of the trusts.

We, however, no more wish to hinder the advance of municipal or national undertakings than to arrest the growth of the trust or combine; but to have them hailed as instalments of Socialism is utterly misleading when they are, in reality, only more efficient means of exploiting the working class for the benefit of property owners.

Let those who regard such things as Socialism ponder the meaning of the use of nationalization by Napoleon, by Bismarck, and even by the Tsar of all the Russias, for the purposes of the ruling class. In truth, it is to be feared that just as a splendid weapon may be powerful for good in just hands but quite as powerful for harm when in the hands of an unscrupulous enemy, so national or municipal industry, however powerful an agent for good when controlled by the workers, may nevertheless be an instrument of fearful economic tyranny when used by the capitalist class for its own ends.

The bogey of the rates. The present municipalization movement, however, appears to regard the condition of the workers as quite a minor consideration. Its great concern is, in fact, to save the rates. But where the shoe really pinches may have been learnt during the past year from the great outcry raised by London property owners and their agents over the rising rates, which, they averred, caused residents and manufacturers to migrate to the outlying districts. Their cry was that the high rates depreciated the value of their property. In several districts, as has already been pointed out in *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD*, there has been a decrease in rents owing to the diminished demand for accommodation following on high rates. Obviously, also, anything which increases the advantages of any district or town, increases the competition for house-room in the favoured district and forces up the rents.

If through the profits on municipal capitalism rates were abolished anywhere, neither the lodgers nor the tenant ratepayers would, in the long run, be one penny the better off, for the landlords would, through the increased number of people attracted by the absence of rates, be enabled to raise the rent until it absorbed the whole of what was formerly paid as rates. Indeed, in all probability the landlords would increase the rent immediately by the amount of rates saved. Judge, then, in whose interests the rate-saving municipalizers are working.

Even the Fabian Society realise the futility of grants in aid of rates, although, as might be expected of that middle-class body, their acts belie them. In *Fabian Tract* No. 107 they say: "You cannot relieve the ratepayer by reducing, or even abolishing, his rates, since freeing a house of rates simply raises the rent. In fact, the ratepayer is only a foolish catpaw for the landlord. At Tonbridge, Bedford, and certain other places, pious founders have endowed the schools so splendidly that education is nobly cheap there. But rents are equivalently high; so that the landlords reap the whole pecuniary value of the endowment. . . . Suppose a misguided millionaire were to take on himself the cost of paving and lighting some London parish, and set on foot a free supply of bread and milk! All that would happen would be that the competition for houses and shops in that parish would rage until it had brought rents up to a point at which there would be no advantage in living in it more than in any other parish. Even parks and open spaces raise rents in London, though, strange to say, London statues do not diminish them."

Clearly, then, to save the rates is not to benefit the working class, nor is the matter mended if tram fares are reduced and municipal services made cheaper, for a precisely similar thing occurs. An improvement in means of transit, or a reduction of fares, immediately causes a proportionate rise in rents in the districts favoured, as numerous instances have shown during the past few years.

The workers, therefore, must beware of those who would lure them from the path of emancipation with the red herring of municipalization. Neither municipal nor State capitalism can ease the worker of his oppressive burden. To improve his lot he must organise with his fellows for the control of industry whether municipal or national, whether under company or trust. And the workers cannot gain control of industry unless they first wrest political power from the hands of the master class in national as well as in local government.

But these facts also explain the extensive and untiring efforts of the capitalist class to retain control of the political machinery, often, it is true, masquerading in local elections as "Independent" or "Non-political" candidates; as though candidates for political power could be non-political! The capitalist class are untiring in their efforts to retain supreme political power, because their continued existence absolutely depends upon their control of that power.

The candidates of the S.P.G.B. therefore, whilst quite prepared to use the local powers for such small temporary benefits as may be forced from the capitalists' hands for the workers in those districts, nevertheless do not seek suffrages for this, which can only be a secondary business of the political party of the workers. The fact, pointed out above, must be strongly reiterated, that the powers of the local bodies are strictly limited and are controlled by the Government.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters into municipal contests as a step in the work of capturing the whole political machinery. Fully realising, and pointing out to the workers, the strict limitations of the power of local bodies, making no promises that are beyond our power to fulfil, we ask the members of our class, when (but not before) they have studied these facts and realised their correctness, to cast their votes for the candidates of the S.P.G.B. who alone stand on the above basis.

In those districts, however, where there are no S.P.G.B. candidates in the field, the workers are asked to abstain from voting altogether, since any votes cast under such circumstances can only assist the enemies of the working class.

A gem from *Justice*:

"The Trade Union Congress of 1906 will remain long in my memory having brought me in touch with a set of earnest comrades whose economic basis is absolutely sound!"

By which we are reminded of that little knowledge which is proverbially dangerous.

A LOOK ROUND.

Socialist propaganda in Bulgaria is not quite such easy work as here, if one may judge from a letter, written in Esperanto, received from a comrade there.

The Socialists held a Congress at Varna in August. Previous to the opening they organised a public meeting. One of the speakers condemned the persecution of the Greeks by the Bulgarians. Naturally, this displeased the "Nationalists." They dubbed the Socialists "pro-Greeks" and threatened to kill the speaker (Harlakov). On August 13th, during the afternoon sitting of the Congress, a band of about 30 hired assassins entered the hall and commenced to shoot with revolvers. About 100 shots in all were exchanged. One Socialist was killed and several wounded, but three of their opponents bit the dust and about a score were wounded. From which it is apparent that the Socialists of Bulgaria are not only prepared to move resolutions, but know how to shoot straight. Harlakov was slightly wounded in the shoulder. The delegates then considered it advisable to change the venue of their Congress and accordingly continued their labours at Shumen.

The balance sheet of the London District Board of the Amalgamated Union of Operative Bakers and Confectioners for June quarter contains some interesting figures. £154 18s. 7d. was paid into the Sick Fund and £227 1s. 6d. paid out. The Management Fund received £128 16s. 11d. and £133 1s. 11d. was expended. Out-of-work contributions amounted to £127 18s. 9d. and payments to members £145 14s. 6d.

It is poor consolation for the members to be informed that the out-of-work payments show a diminution as compared with the previous quarter, in view of the secretary's statement that the decrease is chiefly due to unemployed members having reached the end of the benefit period.

During 1902 this Union made 1,211 new members and lost 1,583. 1,066 were enrolled in 1903 and 1,061 were lost. In 1904 730 joined and 870 were lost, and in 1905 899 joined and 960 fell out. The London District has now commenced to enrol "Trade" members at 2d. per week.

The fact of the matter is that the condition of the working class is becoming so precarious that increasing numbers of them are unable to pay the sums demanded by the Unions and the latter are compelled to pay sick and unemployed benefit at an ever increasing ratio.

The Bakers' Union is concentrating its efforts upon a Forty-eight Hours Bill. "We have determined," says Mr. L. A. Hill in the August issue of the official organ "to re-introduce our Forty-eight Hour Bill into Parliament and to continue if necessary to re-introduce it until victory crowns our efforts and our banners wave upon the ramparts of freedom for the operative baker."

"Freedom" via a Forty-eight Hours Bill is good, especially when the same writer in the same column says "The eight hours day is after all a temporary palliative, which, while it would undoubtedly have the effect for the time being of absorbing the bulk of our unemployed, would not be lasting in its effects."

In the September issue of the *Journymen Bakers' Magazine* Mr. Hill returns to the subject and says "if by Trade Union or legislative action your hours are reduced, your employer, and other employers also, will need more men, and it is not too much to say that every unemployed baker in London will obtain work."

Of course this is sheer nonsense. Already the eight hours day is in operation in several bakeries, and instead of more men being employed there are fewer. And not only so, men who have worked for the "smart yankee" who is running

one of the largest bakeries in London and the suburbs aver that they would sooner work 12 hours in the ordinary shop that does not possess machinery than 8 hours in the machine bakeries.

Without machinery, a skilled baker turns about 10 sacks of flour into bread in a week of sixty hours. In an up-to-date bakery, such as exists in London and Glasgow, 22 sacks is the normal output per man per week. But under exceptional circumstances (say in the event of a strike or lockout) one skilled operative, with the aid of a fireman and unskilled labour, could turn from 100 to 500 sacks of flour into bread in a week. The public would get bread whilst the Trade Union bakers starved. An Eight-Hours Act would not affect the machine bakeries. It is already in vogue there and they can successfully compete against the small shop. The small man could not stand the increase in his wages bill which Mr. Hill claims would follow the passing of the Bill, as the competition of such firms as Price & Co., the V.V., and the Co-operative Societies would prevent him raising the price. He would therefore "go under" and the trade would pass into the hands of the machine bakeries.

The Bishop of Birmingham in dedicating a new chapel at the Aston Workhouse said the problem of the unemployed was complicated by the fact that so many parents were content that their boys earned a little money by selling newspapers, running errands, and such like casual employment. At the time when they wanted to be engaged in a self-respecting industry which would be really useful to the community they found themselves out of employment at the age of 18 or 20 without any trade behind them.

What a heap of money some people get for talking nonsense. Are there no unemployed with a "trade behind them," none who have passed through the various stages and mastered the difficult processes of "a self-respecting industry"? Why even the Trade Unions that made returns to the Board of Trade during August showed that out of a membership of 596,010, 22,528 were unemployed. This is equal to 3.8 per cent.

These would be men "with a trade behind them" and as they represent only a fraction of the Trade Unionists, the extent of unemployment at a period when, according to *Reynold's Newspaper*, we are experiencing the beneficial results of ousting a Tory Government and electing a Radical one can be imagined. If the country contains only five millions of workers with a "trade behind them," there would be, on the basis of the returns made to the Board of Trade, 190,000 unemployed. There's prosperity for you!

Sir J. Crichton Browne was nearer the mark at the Congress of the Sanitary Inspectors' Association at Blackpool when he said "The struggle to acquire property, to win applause, to earn bread was fiercer than ever; the pressure of labour had been transferred from the muscles to the nervous system, for physical energy was supplied by steam and electricity, and it was nerve energy that was needed to control machinery, and the indications were that the nerve tissue that supplied the energy was more easily exhausted than it used to be."

In commenting on the Report of the Inland Revenue Commissioners, which has just been issued, the *Daily News* says: "The income reviewed by the department is estimated at over nine hundred and twelve millions. That is the share of the national income which passes almost entirely to the upper and middle classes in the form of rent, salaries, and profit on businesses. It is a figure continuously leaping upwards. In the changes of ten years the value of English land and houses has advanced by 21 per cent.; the profits of business concerns have increased by 41 per cent.; the salaries of Government, Corporation, and other public company officials increased by the enormous proportion of 67 per cent."

And it is during this ten years that the unemployed problem has reached an intensity never known before; that Trade Unions and Friendly Societies have been faced with an enormous strain upon their Funds owing to the increasing inability of even the "thrifty" members of the working class to find employment and to keep in good health; that the average amount per depositor in the Post Office and Trustee Savings Bank has, since 1899, fallen every year. Truly, the master class is getting richer and the working class is getting poorer.

There were 121,979 persons in England and Wales certified as insane and under care on January 1st, 1906, being 2,150 in excess of the figures recorded on the corresponding day of 1905.

On January 1st, 1906, according to a Parliamentary paper issued by the Local Government Board, there were 926,741 paupers in England and Wales, equal to one in 37 of the population. The proportion in London was 1 in 32. The insane paupers have increased from 19,986 in 1872 to 108,629 in 1906.

It is claimed that the rate of able-bodied paupers per thousand of the population has decreased, their place having been taken by those described as "not able-bodied." This probably means that the working class, in increasing numbers, are being physically and mentally incapacitated.

At a meeting of South Wales steel makers at Swansea on September 2nd it was decided to form an association to be known as the South Wales

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE S.L.P. AND THE S.P.G.B.

GENTS.—It is a fitting finish to the two years and more of coward's silence that a feeble, unsigned attempt has been made to explain the differences between the S.L.P. and the S.P. Anyone of average intelligence can easily see that the writer defeats his own object. To give a detailed history of the London "Impossibilists," and to correct Mr. Jack Fitzgerald's fables in full I should require an issue or more of your paper, therefore I shall simply point where he has mis-stated the truth, and, if my Party (the S.L.P.) are disposed to re-open the matter, I shall go fully into the matter in the columns of our Party Organ (*The Socialist*). If your readers obtain a copy of our paper for July, 1906, they will find therein a reply to some questions of Comrade E. J. B. Allen, a reply to some of the fiction circulated by Mr. Fitzgerald and others. There were several members of the S.D.F. in London who corresponded with our Scotch comrades; and as the so-called London section was unorganised it would be interesting to know who gave Mr. Fitzgerald power to act as correspondent. Granted that Fitzgerald was asked, or took upon himself the task, of writing to London men to turn up to the joint Conference at "Cock and Hoop," on Easter Sunday, 1903, that had nothing to do with his supposed official correspondence with our Scotch comrades after Friedberg had left this country. The London section (so-called) did not suggest that Anderson and MacGregor be invited to that Conference, and I don't imagine for one minute that Anderson would have showed his face there if such an arrangement had been made. Fitzgerald and McNicol were not asked to tell Comrade Geis he was not wanted, and ask him not to turn up to Conference. But there, I see that Mr. Fitzgerald has forgotten to mention that fact. I might state here for the benefit of your readers that I was Chairman of that Meeting, and also elected Secretary of the London Section that really came into being in an organised manner that night, therefore I am competent to know what took place. Yates did not state that they had been building up a new party during the last two years. What Yates did say was "that they had built up an organised section during the last two years, consequently they had the necessary organisation to form a new party when necessary, and after the 1903 S.D.F. Conference that was the only thing they

Siemens Steel Association, having for its object the protection of makers' interests and regulation of trade. Arrangements were made whereby funds will be deposited to place the new association on a proper basis. The chairman is Mr. H. Eccles (Britton Ferry), the vice-chairman Mr. F. Gilbertson (Pontardawe), and the secretary Mr. R. W. Evans (Llanelli).

According to a return recently issued from the Department of Labour and Commerce, Washington, the United States Consul at Lille (Mr. C. J. King) describes a new invention for spinning flax and flax waste. Mr. King says the process, which is one recently patented by Mr. Arthur Guillemand, tends to simplify the present method by applying the system of spinning cotton to flax. It consists in replacing the high cambersome machinery now necessary in flax spinning by low self-acting reels, such as are employed in cotton spinning. The machinery differs little in appearance from the cotton frames, being simply adapted to the exigencies of the flax fibre. The bobbins are set at the back, the yarn running off through the watering tank for wet spinning placed between the bobbins and cylinders. As the yarn passes through the cylinder the water is pressed out into a canal directly under the lower cylinders. The yarn then runs off perfectly dry to the reels, and, owing to the long self-revolutions, a better and smoother yarn is the result. The new method decreases the general expenses and saves labour, and the air of the rooms is less infected, and the floors are changed from stagnant pools into dry and sanitary places. Mr. King adds that the new method should prove of considerable value in the development of the linen industry.

J. KAY.

could do." Elrick who also spoke said "that no self-respecting man could remain any longer in the S.D.F. He was in favour of a London Party affiliated to a Scotch Party." Yates said he "did not want merely a Scotch Party but a party covering England, Scotland and Wales." L. Cotton of Oxford also spoke for formation of a new party covering Great Britain and said we should not succeed as mere local societies. Matheson did the same. If Fitzgerald really believed the fables of Alexander Anderson why did he not bring the so-called charges against the Scotch section forward at that meeting. There was plenty of time after he had returned from seeing Matheson and Yates off at St. Pancras, and if necessary, we could have arranged for a meeting on Easter Monday. No! Fitzgerald preferred to wait until the Scotch Delegates had returned before spreading his charges that have never been proved. His fable about De Leon and his actions at the Amsterdam Conference was refuted before De Leon came to London, and he could have put the question to De Leon at that meeting if he desired, but somehow he did not desire that. My information re De Leon and his credentials came from De Leon himself when I put to him the tale that I had heard from Elrick and that was being circulated among members of your Party. I believe that De Leon also dealt with the yarn in the "Post Box" of the *Weekly People*, but as I have lent my back copies of that paper I cannot say definitely. In conclusion I would point out one can prove anything by merely taking certain sentences out of a man's speeches or writings. Mr. Fitzgerald has done this in his anonymous article (A Statement of Differences) and while it proves him to be a tricky debater it does not say much for his honesty of purpose. Yours etc.,

W. S. JERMAN.

[We are sorry Mr. Jerman has preferred to prejudice his criticism of our article by an exhibition of bad manners that may well be taken as evidence of an ignorance—deplorable in a correspondent—of the mere decencies of discussion. A case is not improved by random and entirely unsubstantiated charges of cowardice and deliberate misrepresentation; nor is it benefited by the laboured irony of, for example, the suggestion that to anyone of average intelligence, our article defeats its own object. Mr. Jerman, of course, does not himself believe that or he would not have been at such pains to endeavour to defeat what had already been defeated. Irony is a two-edged weapon which may only be handled by the literary tyro at the

imminent risk of damage to himself.

That Mr. Jerman is a tyro is clear from the fact that he does not understand that unsigned articles are always editorial. The article in question is from the E.C. of the S.P.G.B., not, as Mr. Jerman so hastily concludes, from our Comrade Fitzgerald writing anonymously.

As, however, Mr. Jerman's letter largely consists of personal references to Fitzgerald, we have asked our comrade for his comments upon the points raised and append his notes. To those notes, we have nothing to add except, in all friendliness, to suggest to Mr. Jerman the advisability of seriously endeavouring to free himself from the limitations of a vocabulary and the heavy handicap of a literary style which are not better but worse for having been imported from America and imperfectly transmitted to us through a sadly defective Scottish grammar-school. Etc.]

A careful comparison of Mr. Jerman's letter with the article mentioned will, I think, render anything in the nature of an extended reply unnecessary. For Mr. Jerman's benefit, however, and as my name is so frequently mentioned, I will briefly deal with the points he attempts to raise.

1. He asks "who gave Fitzgerald power to act as correspondent?" As mentioned in the article, and as Mr. Jerman well knew, when Friedberg, who was the recognised correspondent of the section, left England he handed that business over to myself.

2. Mr. Jerman says "the London section did not suggest that Anderson and MacGregor be invited to meeting." Quite true, as a section, but several members made the suggestion, as Mr. Jerman was aware.

3. As the question of Mr. Geis is not raised in the article Jerman's remarks are entirely gratuitous. I asked Geis to stay away on my own responsibility as he was not a member of the S.D.F. at the time and he promised to do so but broke that promise and came to the meeting place.

4. It is true that Mr. Jerman was chairman of the meeting but there was no secretary, nor were any minutes taken at that meeting. He was appointed secretary to the committee elected to receive information from Scotland and is, therefore, in no better position to speak of what occurred at that meeting than any other member present. His attempted quibble about the words "organised section" as against "New Party" for what difference there may be in them can be refuted by the evidence of several others attending the meeting besides myself, but it is best met by the fact that at the next meeting of the London section held at the "Hope" Coffee Tavern when I repeated the statement now disputed Mr. Jerman did not deny or in any way question that the words "New Party" had been used by Yates.

5. Mr. Jerman's next point re Anderson's fables would be charming in its naivete were it not so clumsy an attempt to avoid an awkward point. Nowhere in the article is anything said about "Anderson's charges." What is said is that it was the Scotchmen who made the charges against Anderson and then refused to meet or face the man they charged and this also Mr. Jerman knew well. The only occasion upon which Anderson's name is used is on the point of forming a New Party behind our backs which Mr. Jerman admits when he says that they (the Scotchmen) "had an organisation ready" and which is fully admitted by J. C. Matheson in the September issue of the *Socialist*. Moreover, if Mr. Jerman was so convinced on these points it is a wonder he did not at once join the London Branch of the S.L.P. instead of waiting several months before doing so.

6. Regarding De Leon's position at Amsterdam, why did Mr. Jerman ignore the points made in the article and try to shuffle out of it by saying he spoke to De Leon himself? Why at the London Meeting did he not bring the matter up while I was speaking to De Leon as he was leaving the Hall? Mr. Jerman will, I think, find the points in the article are posers enough for him to answer whenever he makes a genuine attempt to do so. J. FITZGERALD.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary or from the Head Office of the Party, 28, Currier Street, E.C.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed, —The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	6	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.

SATURDAY, OCT. 6, 1906.



THE PARLIAMENT OF LABOUR.

The Trade Union Congress has met; has been welcomed and sped by his worshipful the Mayor; has endured its presidential address; has passed dozens of resolutions, has attended innumerable functions; has, in short, done all those things it was expected to do after the fashion of Trade Union Congresses from time immemorial, and has passed into the limbo of forgotten things. It leaves behind it the record of a welter of words clothing ideas mainly feeble, fatuous and fallacious, and—that is all! It was the strongest Congress that had ever met but that only seems to have added to the hub-bub. It was presided over, we are told, by a keen, business-like chairman who would stand no nonsense, but that did not save it from mediocrity. It is alleged to have been well in advance of the Congresses that foreran it but only the eye of faith could discern the difference and we do not possess such an eye.

To us there was little indeed in the Congress that could move, and nothing at all that could enthuse us. The chairman's references to unemployment epitomised the mental darkness and confusion in which most of those attending seemed to be, not only upon this but upon most other working-class questions. To talk at this time of day of the causes of and remedies for the unemployed problem being manifold and of a personal as well as an impersonal character is simply grotesque, so much so that we cannot conceive of anyone who has given more than half an hour's serious study to the subject talking such palpable nonsense except with tongue in cheek. Unemployment has its root solely in the private ownership of the means of life and the consequent reduction of labour-power to the character of a commodity on the market, purchasable only when profit can be derived from it. The remedy lies solely in the break-down of such private ownership and the organisation of industry upon the basis of common ownership in the means of life and common participation in the product of labour.

BUSINESS DONE—NONE!

The depressing part of such Congresses to us consists in reflections upon the might-have-beens. Such a gathering of delegates could, if only they represented class conscious constituencies, have sent reverberating round the world a message of encouragement and inspiration and class solidarity to the workers of all coun-

tries that would have carried dismay and confusion into the camps of Capital. But the constituencies are not class conscious and, as we pointed out in our last issue, those who stand as their mouthpieces and champions, are in the main either as ignorant as their following or are apparently less concerned with working-class advancement than with advancement of a more intimate and personal character. And so the watcher on the tower of the enemy's encampment has gone to sleep again. The time for an alarm he can see is not yet. The day when Capital will be called upon to rally all its forces to the defence of its ditches is still to dawn.

We are doing our part to educate our class to a knowledge of their position and of the means whereby that position may be freed of its insecurity and unhappiness and made to ensure a comfort and a joy in living, unknown to the workers as a class to-day. We are doing all we can to marshal their strength in battle array against the powers of the capitalist class already organised and entrenched and fully class conscious. Our work is rendered the more difficult by the obstacles which the ignorance and the knavery of working-class leaders continue to dump in the path of our progress. But we proceed with our purpose quite confident that in the result our class will rally to the banner which we bear aloft and which, alone of the parties claiming working-class support in England, we steadfastly refuse to lower on any pretext or consideration whatever. And then the Trades Congresses or their equivalent will not fritter away their time and opportunity in long and weary discussion upon the practicability or otherwise of demanding a 30s. minimum wage or some other doleful product of the brain of the half-loafer. Half loaves will then fail to attract. Congress will be satisfied with nothing short of the whole baker's shop and will see that it gets it.

Until then Trade Union Congresses will continue to afford a little mild excitement annually to the attending delegates who regard such gatherings generally as in the nature of banquets; they may provide the capitalist Press with a little light "copy"; they may even succeed in whipping up a little interest in their proceedings among the membership of the contributing societies. But the net results so far as real working-class interests are concerned, will, we fear, be summarised in the heading which we have set over this note.

"THE FRAUD OF SOCIALISM."

The journalistic dead season having lived up to its name and left the unfortunate "Yellow" Press Editor with a plentiful lack of that sensational mixture upon which the success of his paper and the realisation of his wages depend; there being no "ripper" murders to write up and no Pekin massacres to record (and the journalistic imagination being apparently unequal to the manufacture of a few); the sea serpent and the giant gooseberry having lost their charm and the lamp-black and lightning having run rather low (misfortunes rarely, if ever, come singly)—all these stand-bys having failed, it is not surprising to find the news sheets casting about somewhat frantically for the where-withal to fill the aching void. And so it comes about that the *Express*—pushful Pearson's periodical—is kindly devoting some of its space to an entirely disinterested consideration of what it is pleased to call Socialism and the fraud thereof.

From a perusal of some of the articles we regretfully conclude that the writer's knowledge of Socialism is considerably less extensive than his knowledge of the manner in which matter should be padded so as to fill the largest possible space. His main fear seems to be that under Socialism initiative will be crushed by a horrible tyranny and the people enslaved (initiative, of course, receiving every encouragement to-day and slavery being unknown!); and he regards with loathing and horror the possible advent of a system of free love which is, it seems, to be one of the main features of the Socialist Society. By which we are led to believe that our "yellow" editor and his contributors have been dipping deep into the rubbish heap of controversy. Their objections were raised in the

childhood of the Socialist movement and doubtless did effective service in their day and generation as logics. But that it is possible to light up fresh candles inside these battered turnip heads and use them again as scare, we doubt if even a "yellow" editor is stupid enough to believe.

AN EXPLANATION AND NEMESIS!

Two points which have arisen in connection with the "Fraud of Socialism" series call for comment. The first is as to the interview the *Express* representative is supposed to have had with an official of the S.P.G.B. who gave him the Party view of the burning question of Trade Unionism. It is true that an *Express* representative called at the Head Office of the Party. It is not true that our official gave the *Express* man the information printed as the view of the Party on Trade Unionism. The *Express* writer has taken a paragraph from the discussion on Trade Unionism published in this journal and represented it as the Party's attitude. It happens that it is not the Party attitude at all. The impression is therefore forced upon us that as there is no immediate opportunity of "faking" a massacre, the "yellow" Press is keeping its hand in by "faking" an interview—a rather novel application of the arts of war to the requirements of peace!

The other point the *Express* makes with some very good ground indeed. It argues that a deliberate endeavour has been made by men who at times profess Socialism, to capture the funds of the Trade Unions with the object of entering, and maintaining themselves in, Parliament. It alleges that in order to effect their purpose these men have disguised their Socialism under the ambiguous guise of "Labour" knowing quite well that they could not obtain support otherwise.

While we are not concerned to impute motives there is unfortunately very good evidence which can be adduced in support of this charge. The S.P.G.B. came into existence as a protest against the methods of Parties which, while claiming to be Socialist, obscured their Socialism by relegating it to a position of greater or lesser obscurity, and confused important issues by compromise; in order to ensure working-class support for their candidates. From our point of view the man who lowers his flag in deference to ignorant popular clamour so that he may secure for himself place and power, has sold himself and his ideal for a mess of pottage and ceased to stand as champion of the movement from which he "rattled." This is had enough. But if he "rats" with the deliberate intention of deceiving those who support he has secured by so doing, and having obtained his position uses it to further the object he ostensibly rejected when appealing for support, he is guilty of a deplorably indecent act which will undoubtedly redound to his own discredit as well as to the injury of the movement with which he is associated.

The case of the I.L.P. is in point. Members of that Party have obscured the Socialism they sometimes profess and have obtained the support of L.R.C. funds while masquerading as "Labour" men. In defence of this position Keir Hardie has himself argued that in the L.R.C. they were neither Liberal nor Tory nor Socialist, reducing Socialism to the same category as capitalist Liberalism or Toryism. Keir Hardie and his friends, now that they seem disposed to become Socialists again (howbeit Socialists of the New Testament type—whatever weird species that may be) must not be surprised, therefore, if the appellation "fraud" is attached to them and if they are forcefully reminded of their own argument. If inside the L.R.C. they are neither Liberal nor Tory nor Socialist, Hardie can only now press his Socialism as an L.R.C. member, by throwing over the platform upon which he stood when he secured L.R.C. support. We cannot defend the I.L.P. members and those who act with them from the charge brought against them. The charge is true. We protest, however, against it being shifted to apply to Socialism. We deplore and repudiate the actions of these professing Socialists against whom it can be quite fairly brought, but the failure of its professors notwithstanding, Socialism still remains as the only hope of the workers.

DEBATE ON INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM.

"Is the Industrial Workers of the World worthy the support of the working class?" was the subject of debate between G. Geis, S.L.P. (affirmative) and J. Fitzgerald, S.P.G.B. (negative) on Peckham Rye on Sunday evening, August 12th. W. Russell, S.P.G.B., acted as chairman.

Geis, in opening, corrected a remark by the chairman in which he suggested that the I.W.W. owed its origin to the S.L.P. The I.W.W. was not formed by, nor was it in any way under the control of the S.L.P., or any political organisation whatsoever. With regard to the question in debate, he had first to call attention to the object of the capitalist method of production, which was the extraction of surplus value from the working class. Hence arose the class struggle—on the part of the capitalist class to take from the workers as much as possible of the wealth that was alone produced by labour, and on the part of the working class to resist such exploitation. In the early period of capitalism the organisations formed by the workers were capable of fighting the small and unorganised capitalists with comparative success. Since that time the power of capital had developed enormously; at the present time the capitalist class was well organised economically and politically, whereas the working class was not well organised in either respect. Indeed, trade unionism, instead of adapting itself to changing conditions, had remained in its infancy, so to speak. It was now necessary for the workers to organise industrially on the basis of the class struggle. Craft unionism was played out and incapable either of offering resistance to, or advancing against the exploiting class. The outcome of craft unionism was well exemplified in the observations of a recent deputation of German working men to this country—a deputation, it should be noted, by no means revolutionary, but composed of persons eminently respectable, orthodox, and capitalistic. They commented most unfavourably on the uncleanly and unkempt appearance of British working people, and on their social and domestic condition generally. They were especially impressed, however, with the good understanding which existed between employers and employed. This, in their opinion, was an achievement due to the fine diplomatic spirit of the British race. Representatives of each side met, and the employers got the men's leaders to understand. The function of the labour leader, commented Geis, was similar to that of the lightning-rod. The masters instructed the labour leaders, and the labour leaders instructed the men. The labour leaders, as accessories of the capitalist class, had their reward. The report of the delegation referred to was in fact an unintentional indictment of pure and simple trade unionism. The German delegates expressed the view that the big unions were anything but altruistic; the skilled workers organised themselves in their own selfish interests, without any kind of regard for the welfare of the unskilled, the unorganised, and the unemployed. Geis pointed out that of a working population of 14,000,000 but 2,000,000 were at present organised. The higher wages and better conditions of the organised minority afforded no justification for the exclusiveness of craft unionism, for if the whole working-class were organised the condition of all might be improved. As a commodity in the labour market the price of labour-power (wages) was regulated by supply and demand. The formation of a complete trust in the labour market, such as was implied in the form of industrial unionism he advocated, would force the condition of the working class infinitely higher; the obstacle which prevented such a comprehensive industrial organisation was the job-trust, pure and simple trade unionism now existing. Apart from wresting from the capitalist class an ever increasing share of the product of labour, the mission of industrial unionism was to overthrow the capitalist system altogether, which was the logical and inevitable termination of the class struggle. In America, where the I.W.W. was a growing power, its main object was the overthrow of capitalism, but in the pursuit of that object it would incidentally raise wages and reduce the hours of labour. The purpose of the advocates of Industrial Unionism in this country was to start as

soon as practicable a similar new organisation of the working class, for the existing craft unions, with their notions of the mutual relationship of employer and employed, and their exclusiveness and selfishness, were useless and irremediable. Geis then gave a number of examples of craft union action to show how the capitalist class took advantage of the sectional organisation of the working class, and how the sections fought and "scabbled" upon one another to their own detriment and undoing. There could, he said, be no hope for the working class until it was organised, on the basis of the class struggle, in one vast world-wide organisation, co-extensive with capitalism itself, for the overthrow of the capitalist system. It was the duty of working men to understand the principles laid down by the advocates of Industrial Unionism, and by corresponding action to put an end to the unspeakable conditions under which they, the workers, could not be said to live, but merely existed.

Fitzgerald said he was, of course, in entire agreement with his opponent regarding the necessity of complete economic organisation in the working class. In the capitalist system the workers did not own the wealth their labour produced; it accumulated in the ownership of the numerically small capitalist class; the relationship of the two classes was, therefore, simply that of robber and robbed. The complete monopoly of the resources of production compelled the workers to sell their labour-power as merchandise to the capitalist class for wages, or in other words, for the bare cost of maintaining and reproducing their productive energies, according to various circumstances and conditions. Hence it became necessary from time to time for the workers to debate with the capitalists the price at which they would sell their labour-power. Necessarily, as the capitalist system developed they found themselves at an increasing disadvantage in their bargaining for subsistence. What Fourier had foreseen—namely, that competition would result in the combination of the competing parties—was surely being realised, and the workers were now confronted with a position in which the capitalist class was becoming smaller and increasingly powerful. For example, during the Engineers' strike of 1898 eight firms practically dominated the steel industry; since that time the number had been reduced to about four. Such concentration implied economy of management, especially in the reduction of the number of wage-workers. The promoters of the Milk Trust in America had estimated that when their scheme was in full operation they could dispense with the services of 11,000 "hands." Again, when Allsopps, Salts, and the Burton Brewery Co. decided to combine, notices were given to a large number of the staff. It had been suggested that the craft form of unionism was responsible for unemployment and the helpless condition of the working class; on the contrary, Fitzgerald contended that no form of unionism—even Socialist unionism—could of itself materially or permanently improve their condition in the capitalist system, under which the application of every new scientific process to industry, or higher organisation, necessarily increased the number of the unemployed. The unions, as at present organised, it was true, by insisting on the payment of high initiation fees and subscriptions in times of crisis, had thereby forced large numbers out of their ranks; they had unquestionably impaired their own effectiveness by increasing the number of the unorganised, who, driven by the whip of starvation, were used against them in periods of depression. Furthermore, until the workers recognised their class position, and so long as they did not realise the necessity of organising on a Socialist basis to overthrow the capitalist system, sectional differences and internal disorganisation would continue. There were certain delusions prevailing, however, regarding the Socialist basis of trade unions. The mere adoption of a Socialist preamble did not constitute a union a Socialist union. The Gas Workers' Union and one of the Burnley Weavers' unions had a Socialist preamble, but owing to the ignorance of the rank and file they had not expressed in action the principles by which they were supposed to be guided. In a Socialist union the members would clearly recognise that the overthrow of the capitalist system was only attainable by the united effort of the working class to

wrest political authority from the capitalist class. Revolutionary political action was essential in a real Socialist union.

It had been claimed for the I.W.W. that it was a Socialist union. Take the craft unions just referred to: the I.W.W. did not call itself Socialist, nor did its members exhibit any clearer understanding of Socialist aims than the "pure and simple" unionists they condemned. The I.W.W. was not, in fact, a Socialist union at all. "We must not overlook the fact," said Delegate Klemensic at the first Convention of the I.W.W. at Chicago, "that we are here as working men, and as such we do not recognise the Socialist, the Anarchist, or any other kind of 'ism.'" This expression of opinion drew no protest from De Leon, nor from any other members of the Socialist Labour Party or Socialist Trades and Labour Alliance who were present. When Keir Hardie, at Darlington, Newcastle, had stated that the Labour Party was not out for Toryism, Liberalism, or Socialism, but for Labourism, the Socialist Party of Great Britain had not hesitated to condemn his attitude. What distinction could be drawn between the positions taken respectively by Klemensic and Keir Hardie? Moreover, the Preamble of the Industrial Workers of the World contained a remarkable contradiction as follows:

Between these two classes a struggle must go on until all the workers come together on the political as well as on the industrial field, and take and hold that which they produce by their labour through an economic organisation of the working class without affiliation with any political party.

How could they come together on the political field if they were kept apart by non-affiliation? Naturally enough, a big battle raged over this clause in the Chicago Convention. Delegate Clarence Smith said:

It seems to me that this paragraph of the Preamble particularly is intended, not to represent the principles and purposes of industrialism but represents a toadyism to three different factions in this Convention, and I am opposed to this organisation toadying to any man or any faction of men.

It seems to me that this paragraph could not have been more involved or more confusing if it had been written by the platform committee of the Republican or Democratic Party. It seems to me as if the paragraph is intended to be toadying to the man who does not believe in politics at all, the pure and simple trade unionist as we have come to call him; that it means a toadying to the Socialist, and also to the Anarchist, if you please. It seems to me that this paragraph is intended to be such that the supporter of this movement can point to it when talking to a pure and simple unionist and say "That is just what you want and expresses what you believe in." I believe it is intended to be such that a Socialist can be pointed to this platform with the statement that "This is Socialism." I believe it is intended to be such that an Anarchist can be confronted and told that "This means Anarchy as it is written right in this paragraph."

Delegate Murtaugh also made a statement which revealed a confusion of political elements in the I.W.W., which similarly characterises craft unionism:

It is useless for us here to attempt to disguise the fact that we have every shade of political opinion. We have the Socialists—I happen to be one of them—who believe that action in the political line is absolutely necessary. We have the Socialists, on the other hand, who are so near the Anarchist that he is beginning to think as the Anarchist does—that action along the political line is absolutely harmful instead of being useful.

Thus within the I.W.W. according to Murtaugh, there were those who were prepared to repeat the old cry of "no politics in the trade unions."

There was a suggestion made at this Conference that no member of the I.W.W. should be allowed to accept nomination for office in a capitalist political party, whereupon Klemensic pointed out that this would conflict with the position of the Western Federation of Miners in Butte, Montana, where they formed part of the Republican party. Mr. Haggerty, the delegate of the Butte district of the Western Federation of Miners, made the following statement:

It is true that back in the State of Montana we have a peculiar condition of things. Some five or six years ago I attended the convention of the state labour movement in the city of Helena in September, 1899. I went with the delegation from the organisation that sent me to this convention. It devolved upon that convention to go forth and organise what we knew as a political party. After the party had been organised, capitalist parties commenced to lay plans to seize upon it. We found the Anamalgamated Mining Company upon one side, and Senator Clark and F. A. Henne upon the other at war. There was an opportunity we could not miss. We seized upon the opportunity

Clark wanted to become a U.S. Senator, and F. A. Heinze wanted something else, and we knew it. I maintain that we did not go to them, but compelled them to come to us; but nevertheless there was a capitalist combination with a labour party, and hence it became capitalistic. We went to the polls and united our movement to theirs. Twelve men went to the legislative body from that county. In the division we got six of the twelve. We got the sheriff of the county, the coroner, and others. I was nominated for the office of county commissioner and was elected.

Continuing, Fitzgerald pointed out that in Colorado two years ago the Western Federation of Miners had passed through an experience that threw our Featherstone shooting entirely in the shade. Yet at the following election they voted for a capitalist Governor in that state—and this was the organisation that claimed to be "the most radical and revolutionary in America," and which formed the most important and powerful section of the Industrial Workers of the World. Obviously the elements composing the I.W.W. were indistinguishable from the "pure and simple" unionists represented at our Trade Union Congress! One of the arguments used against craft unionism by the advocates of Industrial Unionism was that they excluded the unorganised by high initiation fees and subscriptions. But comparison of these charges made by a typical craft union like the Operative Bricklayers' Society and those made by the I.W.W. was certainly not favourable to the latter. Thus the initiation fee of the I.W.W. was twice as large as that of the O.B.S., while the latter allowed 180 days' subscriptions in arrear before exclusion, and the I.W.W. only 60, or one-third of that time, as shown by the Constitution and By-laws of the I.W.W. In action, therefore, it was also difficult to distinguish between the I.W.W. and "pure and simple" craft unionism.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

CORRESPONDENCE IN BRIEF.

H.P. writes that he recently visited Glasgow and Edinburgh. In the former town he found that 16 members of the S.L.P. out of a branch of 24 had left owing to the Party's support of the I.W.W., and half the members of the Edinburgh branch had left for the same reason.

An S.D.F. member wants proof that W. Thorne M.P. has accepted the position of J.P. conferred on him by the capitalist class. We suggest that our correspondent write direct to Mr. Thorne, asking (1) whether he consented that his name should be submitted to the proper authorities for a J.P. ship; (2) whether he has taken the oaths of office; (3) whether he is now endeavouring to get his name struck off the roll of J.P.s; and (4) whether this last endeavour is due, wholly or partly, to our criticism of his conduct.

East Ham L.L.P. can find Mr. J. R. McDonald's speeches, referring to the Labour Party's arrangement with the Liberals at Leicester at the General Election in the Leicester daily papers for January 6th and 16th last, and Mr. J. Parker's arrangement with the Liberals at Halifax is admitted by Mr. M. J. Blatchford in the *Halifax Guardian* for January 20th.

HAVE WE LABELLED MR. R. BELL, M.P.?

THE COURTS TO DECIDE.

A writ, claiming damages for libel alleged to be contained in an article which appeared in the August issue of *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD*, has been issued against the Executive Committee of the S.P.G.B. by Mr. Richard Bell, M.P., the General Secretary, and the Executive Committee of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants.

Comrades desiring to contribute to the Defence Fund should send in their contributions early and often to the Head Office, 28, Curator Street, E.C. It is essential that the Party should be in a position to fight the matter out. All contributions will be acknowledged direct to the senders.

DECLINED WITH THANKS.

WHY THE WEST HAM BRANCH COULD NOT JOIN THE LOCAL "LABOUR" PARTY.

West Ham & District Trades & Labour District.
Town Hall, West Ham.
19th July, 1906.

Dear Sir,—The following resolution was passed by my Council at their last meeting:

That the Trades Council convene a Conference representative of all Trade Union Branches and Socialist Organisations in the Borough for the purpose of forming a local Labour Party on the lines of the National Labour Party. The Conference to consist of two delegates from the Trades Council, two delegates from each Trade Union Branch affiliated and unaffiliated, two delegates from each of the Socialist Organisations, viz., S.D.F., I.L.P., S.P.G.B., and Socialist League.

Your Branch are therefore invited to appoint two delegates to attend the Conference, which will be held in the second week in August.

I shall be glad if you will let me know at your earliest convenience if your Branch are prepared to take part in the Conference, together with the names and addresses of your two delegates in order that I may send them date, time and place of Meeting. Yours fraternally,
J. GILBEY, Secretary.

447, Katherine Rd., Manor Park,
29 August, 1906.

Dear Sir,—I have to transmit the following resolution passed by the W.H. Br., S.P.G.B. at its last meeting in reply to yours of 19th July last, asking us to send delegates to a meeting convened by the W.H. & D.T. & L.C. with the object of forming a local Labour Party on the lines of the National Labour Party, to which invitation I promised in my note of 14 Aug. a reply as soon as the Branch had time to fully consider the matter. Your obedient servant,
G. C. H. CARTER, Br. Sec.
J. Gilbey, Esq., Sec. W.H. & D.T. & L.C.

RESOLUTION.

That we, the members of the West Ham Br., S.P.G.B., having considered the invitation of 19th July last by the W.H. & D.T. & L.C. to send delegates to a meeting convened by that body for the purpose of forming a "local Labour Party on the lines of the National Labour Party," wish to make clear the reasons which compel us to decline taking such action.

As a loyal branch of the S.P.G.B., whose declared object is the establishment of a system of Society based on the common ownership and democratic control of the means of life, we are not only unable to work with, but are distinctly hostile to, any party on the political field, such as the L.R.C., or any local party on its lines, whose aims, objects, and methods are so opposite to ours.

We have re-read the reports of the Conferences of the L.R.C., and are more convinced than ever of the confusion existing in the minds of those initiating the establishment of that political party. Take for instance Resolution I of the first (1900) meeting (which was an amendment to a motion in favour of the working class being represented in the House of Commons by members of their own class) seconded by John Burns, M.P. in a speech during which that (now Rt. Hon.) gentleman stated that "he believed they should consider parties and policies apart from class organisations." These members of class organisations (Trade Unions, &c.) obediently detached themselves from their class, negated their class organisations and by a majority of 102 to 3 resolved that "the working class should be represented in the House of Commons by men sympathetic with the aims and demands of the Labour movement."

Again, the motion by James Macdonald of the S.D.F. endeavouring to place the Party on the only true working-class basis of the Class War was negated by these working-class representatives by 59 to 35, Sexton saying "it was very magnificent, it was very heroic, but it was not war." The resolution was reviving a spirit responsible for more recrimination than anything else in the Labour movement.

He was in favour of the spirit of the resolution and would vote for it anywhere but there.

Coming to the Darn Crook Conference of 1903 we find they have got the length of an "object," viz., "a group in Parliament with whips and its own policy on Labour questions." J. N. Bell, the chairman at that Conference, points out in his speech the danger to Trade Union funds by process of law, the aggressive attitude of British Capitalism, the development of Shipping Rings, Trusts, and other American inventions, the Housing Question, Old Age Pensions, Unemployment, etc., and goes on to say "if some years ago straight-forward and satisfactory statements had been given on some of these questions it is possible that such a gathering as the present might not have been necessary."

Considering this speech in connection with the "object" (a Party with whips, etc.) we consider the S.P. of G.B. is justified in stating (as it does in its "Manifesto" p.7) "The L.R.C. came into existence chiefly, as far as the rank and file of the Unions were concerned, owing to the Taff Vale and Quinn v. Leatham decisions, and, as far as the Trade Union officials were concerned, because they saw the chance of Parliamentary jobs."

There is much more of interest and instruction in this (1903) Report, especially when read in the light of subsequent history. Take two statements by two typical men, at almost two opposite poles of the "Labour movement":

John Ward (now Lib.-Lab. M.P.) says "they wanted to get their feet well planted in the House of Commons and he believed they would not be particular about the way in which they did it." Keir Hardie (Lab. M.P.) is reported as saying, "they should be neither Socialists, Liberals, nor Tories but a Labour Party," and we find the space between these two poles filled in with a mixture in varying proportions of the two ideas.

At the Liverpool Conference of 1905 we find the L.R.C. (your model), have arrived not merely at an "object" (a party with whips) but have, from the Nebo heights to which they have been led, described in the telescopic distance an "ultimate object." This "ultimate object" is too far off, however, to be clearly seen, much less understood, even by the seers of the Party, if we may judge by a statement over the signatures of some of them, from Burns and Bell on the one hand to Ramsay Macdonald and Keir Hardie on the other. We find in the United Labour Manifesto against Chamberlainism signed, among others, by those gentlemen, it is stated, "Protection would limit the power of the Trade Unions to improve the condition of the wage-earners" and then they go on to state as counter proposals, "we appeal to the workers of the country to support us in a campaign which will benefit the industrious classes by increasing National efficiency and securing a substantial reduction in the cost of production."

How could the condition of the wage-earners be improved by the cheapening of production or by efficiency? By cheapening production you cheapen commodities including labour-power, i.e., you lower money-wages leaving real wages as before. Where then is the improvement? Further, not only is there no improvement in the condition of the workers employed, but the aggregate wages of the working class are lowered by the increase in the number of the unemployed: the inevitable result of efficiency under capitalism.

If these prophets of Labour, instead of passing pious resolutions in favour of ultimate Socialism which they appear neither to believe nor understand, would turn their attention to immediate common sense, not to say anything so advanced as logic or economics, they might ultimately become less purblind leaders of the blind, though certainly not so successful political tricksters.

During the General Election campaign not only did their "ultimate Socialism" become so

very ultimate as to be unworthy of serious mention, but their boasted independence, that terribly extreme policy which prevented Steadman, one of their founders, from signing their declaration, also became so "ultimate" as to be unavailable for immediate use.

We were informed by the *Daily News* of 15th Jan., 1906, that "Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald and Mr. H. Broadhurst on separate platforms are urging that electors should not plump but allocate their votes to the two Progressives." This was confirmed after the election by the local papers in which Mr. Broadhurst is reported to have said, "he was proud of the Liberal Party and of the Labour Party of Leicester who had brought about this great triumph. Liberalism and Labour had known no difference. . . . This was what they did when they had confidence in each other." Mr. J. R. Macdonald is reported as saying that "there was one significant fact about the contest. Practically every voter of the 14,000 had polled Broadhurst and Macdonald. The plumping had been insignificant. . . . owing to the crises—the crisis to Trade Unionism and the crisis to industry they had co-operated on these specific and definite points to kill the late government and prevent things going from bad to worse." "Hurrah! for Liberalism and Labour!" says Broadhurst. "Hurrah! for Labour and Liberalism!" says Macdonald. "Hurrah! for Tweedledum and Tweedledee, and the independence of Tweedledum!" say we.

It sounds like the language of two separate sections of the same Trust with two different local names professing independence and excusing the similarity of their language by a crisis common to both. Macdonald was no more independent of Broadhurst than Liberalism was of "Labour." There was no independence on either side.

Whatever pious resolutions the L.R.C. may pass in favour of ultimate Socialism, independence, etc., the language and actions of their members point to a stronger belief in Lib.-Labism if not ultimate Liberalism.

Their professed independence which at its best has about the same relation to even an "ultimate" Socialist attitude to other political parties as the Zulu cotton-thread-on-sticks magic had to the English Field-telegraph has been illustrated locally by Will Crooks and Will Thorne. Both these gentlemen, as you no doubt recollect, supported an ostensibly Free Trade meeting in Stratford (really got up to support the candidature of its chairman Masterman). Thorne by letter wishing it success, and excusing himself from attendance on account of a prior engagement. Crooks by a speech during which he alluded to Mr. Masterman as "your member."

During the General Election, perhaps to demonstrate principles held by company kept, or it may be to illustrate the proverb, "birds of a feather," Crooks and Thorne, flanked by Passmore Edwards and G. Cadbury, appear as supporters of the Liberal Percy Alden in the company of Buxton, Gladstone, Burns, and Asquith. Crooks and Thorne are local members of the National Party on whose lines you propose forming, or perhaps ere now have formed, a local party.

Should any professed Socialists not understanding the principles of Socialism be tempted to join and, from the Local Party following too closely the "lines" of the National Party, find themselves compelled to withdraw, it may be as well they should know the treatment meted out by the secretary of the National Party to the S.D.F. on their retirement.

In the *International Socialist Review* of June, 1903, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald writes: "Two years ago the S.D.F. ceased to co-operate because it alleged the Committee was not receiving sufficient support from the Trade Unions. . . . The I.L.P. will support such movements in spite of a handful of more timorous and dogmatic Socialists."

In short, even were we not prevented by our principles and policy from voluntarily associating ourselves with any un-class-conscious political action such as you propose, a statement like the above from the point of view of tactics alone would prove sufficient deterrent.

Even supposing ourselves destitute not only of principles and policy but of political experience or aptitude, we could take warning as to the folly of compromise from part of the chair-

man's speech at the L.R.C. Conference of 1903. He said (Report, p. 22): "The path of compromise is often alluring, and the path of principle is nearly always difficult to tread, but in deciding which way we shall take we cannot afford to forget that by following principle we are certain that it leads, however slowly, to the object we wish to attain, while compromise may lead us there, but may also lead us in a hundred other directions."

While thanking you for your invitation, which, however, we are convinced must have been sent in utter ignorance or misunderstanding of the principles of the S.P.G.B., we would invite the attention of your members to some of the literature published by our Party, notably the "Manifesto," and *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Id. monthly (28, Curator St., E.C.) which in every copy up to the present one contains the "Object and Declaration of Principles."

Yours faithfully,

G. C. H. CARTER, Br. Sec.

THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF MORALITY.

AS ALL the advantages of the rearing of animals come to be realised, the savage "pack" gradually changes into a society of shepherds or herdsmen, in which the men are engaged in tending cattle, sheep, or goats, while to the women fall the subordinate offices of spinning the wool, milking the cows and goats, and making the butter and cheese. The men drive the flocks to pasture and water, regulate the breeding, guard the folds against enemies, decide which of the animals shall be killed for food, and break in the beasts of burden.

But in these pastoral pursuits it gradually becomes apparent to the men that *labour* is a valuable thing. A man who has been very successful in cattle-rearing requires a number of "hands" to keep his herds in order. Besides the domestic labour performed by women, he requires the outdoor labour of men, to prevent the cattle from straying or being stolen, to drive them to pasture in the morning and bring them back at night. To this demand for labour we probably owe two of the great institutions of the pastoral age: *permanent marriage and slavery*. There is really, as we shall see, nothing out of place in taking these two together, odd as the connection may sound to modern ears.

Permanent marriage is one of the essential features of patriarchal society. By superficial writers, its appearance is often attributed to some vague improvement in morality or taste. Unhappily, the facts point to a much less exalted origin, viz., *the desire of the man to secure for himself exclusively the labour of the woman and her offspring*. If the change had come about from exalted ideas of morality, we should probably have found two features in the new system: (1) equality of numbers between the man and the woman; (2) free consent to the marriage on both sides. It is notorious that just the opposite are the facts of the patriarchal system, at any rate at its earlier stages. Polygamy, or plurality of wives, is the rule; and while the husband is not at all particular about the conduct of his wife with other men, he is intensely strict about appropriating the whole of her labours; and all her offspring, no matter who is the real father, belong to him. Again, the ancient forms of marriage, viz., marriage by *capture* and marriage by *purchase*, point irresistibly to the conclusion that the woman had little or no voice in the matter. In the case of marriage by *capture*, the husband carried off his wife by force from a neighbouring tribe; and long after the reality of this practice has disappeared, it survives, as is well known, in a fictitious form all over the world. It is considered, barely decent for the girl to come to the marriage without a show of force. Even in polite modern society the "best man" is said to be a survival of the friends who went with the bridegroom in ancient days to help him to carry off his bride, while the bridesmaids are the lady's companions, who attempted to defend her from the audacious robber, and the wedding tour is a survival of the flight from the angry relatives of the bride. In the more peaceful form of marriage by *purchase*, the lady has become an article of marketable value, whose price is paid, usually in cattle or sheep, to her relatives or owners. It is a refinement of modern

days that the "bride-price" should be settled on the lady herself, or contributed in the form of marriage gifts, to stock the future home. In ancient times it was paid, if not in hard cash, at any rate in solid cattle, to the damsel's relatives, who, by the marriage, lost the value of her services. Jacob, we know, paid for his wives by labour; but this was probably an exception. In patriarchal society, the father of a round dozen of strong and well-favoured daughters is a rich man.

Slavery arises from the practice of keeping alive captives taken in war, instead of putting them to death. In savage days wars are usually the result of scarcity of food, and result in the killing and eating of members of a stranger "pack." But, with the increasing certainty of food supply, resulting among other benefits from pastoral pursuits, cannibalism becomes unnecessary, and captives are carefully kept alive in order that they may labour for their captors. It may sound odd to speak of slavery as a beneficial institution, but one of the first lessons which the student of history has to learn is that things which to us now seem very wicked may really have been at one time improvements on something much worse. Slavery is an ugly thing, but it is better than cannibalism. Again, however, we notice that the upward step was due, not to exalted morality, but to practical convenience. *Morality is the result, not the cause, of social amelioration.*

EDWARD JENKS, M.A., "A History of Politics."

PARTY NOTES.

The Party Outing, at Watford, on Sept. 9th, was a great success; so also was the meeting, held in the evening, in the Market Place.

Several members of the Islington Branch having been expelled, the branch is being reorganised, and any person living in the Islington district who is prepared to accept our Declaration of Principles is invited to communicate with C. H. Wilcox, 25, Mountgrove-road, Highbury, N.

A fresh supply of Party Emblems has been obtained, and can be procured by members from their Branch Secretaries.

No. 2, of the "S.P.G.B. Library," "FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM," is selling well. Branches should push this at all their meetings.

The Delegate Meeting will be held at the Communist Club, on Saturday, Oct. 27th, at 10 p.m. Branches should see that they are represented by their full quota of delegates.

Our Comrades at Battersea and Tooting are contesting the local elections in their respective districts. The Election Address on which the candidates will run is a fitting answer to those alleged Socialists who say that we must adopt a palliative programme when we contest municipal elections.

To-morrow (Sunday, Oct. 7th) a debate will take place, in Finsbury-Park, at 3.30 p.m., between Mr. J. Davis (Liberal) and A. Anderson (S.P.G.B.). Meetings every Sunday at 3 p.m.

On Friday, Oct. 26th, at 8 p.m., the Peckham Branch will commence a series of meetings in the Public Hall, Rye-Lane.

On that evening J. Kent will speak on "The S.P.G.B. and Municipal Elections."

Open-air meetings will be held during October at the usual stations if the weather permits.

During October the following meetings will be held in Manchester: Sundays, 11.30, corner of Tib-street and Piccadilly; 7.30, Trafford Broadway; Mondays, 8.15, corner of Russell-st. and Stretford-rd.; Tuesdays, 8.15, corner of Liverpool-st. and Trafford Bridge-rd.; Wednesdays, 8.15, corner of Medlock-street and Trafford-road.

Fridays, 8.15, corner of Russel-street and Trafford Road.

* * *

Battersea branch will run a special series of out-door meetings this month. Every Tuesday and Friday evening at Prince's Head; every Wednesday evening at Battersea Square; every Thursday evening at Plough Road. T. W. Allen, J. Fitzgerald, T. A. Jackson, J. Crump, F. E. Dawkins, H. Newman, and our municipal candidates will be among the speakers.

* * *

Tooting also will hold meetings in The Broadway every Sunday, Monday, Wednesday, and Saturday evening to advance the course of their municipal candidates.

W. G.

AT RANDOM.

It is a significant commentary on the time-worn and threadbare policy of retrenchment and reform that was going to benefit the working class so much when the Liberal Party came into power, that the only perceptible influence upon the workers of that policy of economy is the discharge of a large number of workmen from the Government workshops. Woolwich is feeling the pinch pretty severely.

Yet there are some who cannot see that the Liberal party represents the interests of the master class against the workers. In politics, as in industry, what is the capitalist's meat is the working man's poison. In order that the capitalist ratepayer may have his burden lightened, the working class must be taught to starve.

If you lack necessities in spite of your labour, it is because your masters enjoy luxury in spite of their idleness.

John D. Rockefeller wants the people to hold fast to the simple life. Meanwhile he holds fast to the almighty dollar.—*The Worker*.

SOME PUBLICATIONS.

We have received the second of the two six-penny parts in which Messrs. Watts are issuing Professor Haeckel's "The Evolution of Man." This is an even more remarkably cheap production than the first, as it covers 192 pages, contains 199 illustrations, and is furnished with an index and a new portrait of the author. The two parts can now be obtained in one well-bound cloth volume at 2s. net.

Also in "Cheap Reprint" form, Thomas Paine's "Rights of Man," edited by Mrs. H. Bradlaugh Bonner, and "Religious Persecution: A Study in Political Psychology," by E. S. P. Messrs. Watts & Co., the publishers, inform us they are issuing in the same form "The New Scientific System of Morality," by G. Gore, F.R.S., and "The Cultivation of Man," by C. A. Wittichell.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND TRADE UNIONISM.

The report of the Party discussion on this subject has been unavoidably held over until our next issue.

VOL. II

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Sept., 1905 to Aug., 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered.

Post Free 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be addressed S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

Branch Secretaries and others SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers.

Printed by Jacobus Bros., 11, 13, 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

That the Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of

KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Eherter Program."

POST FREE 1d.

S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE

28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Secretary, 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Sundays at 8.30.

FULHAM.—J. H. PHIPPS, Secretary, 309, North End Road.

ISLINGTON.—Secretary, C. H. Wilcox (pro. tem.), 25, Mountgrove Rd., Highbury, N.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Sundays at 12 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Gorrings Dining Rooms, Gorrings Park Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets Mondays 8 p.m., at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road. Thos. Dicks, Secretary.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Pk. Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following

BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.

BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.

BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.

LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnum Grove, Litherland.

MANCHESTER.—J. S. Maxwell, 84, Dorset St., Hulme.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Laura Rogers, 15, Wallis Avenue.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD

Vol. I. (Bound) 3s. 6d.

Vol. II. 3s. 6d.

Unbound Copies 1 to 12 1s. 6d.

Do. do. 13 to 24 1s. 6d.

MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. 1d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO 2d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1d.

JONES' BOY 1d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 6d.

ALL POST FREE.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 27. Vol. 3.]

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

Mediaeval Russia.

The appeal from the International Socialist Bureau on behalf of the Russian revolutionaries which we publish elsewhere, is an interesting document and, like the Revolution itself, gives a working man much food for thought. We by no means desire to dogmatise respecting the events which are now passing in Russia, the more so since reliable news from that quarter is scanty and unsatisfactory. Yet the evidence before us, the news from the seat of the revolution, and the communication which we publish from the Bureau, give rise to grave misgivings. The other great nations of Europe have long ago burst asunder the feudal bonds on industry and commerce, and the few survivals are more picturesque than effective. The aristocracy, where it has been able to continue in existence, is merged into the plutocracy and forms one compact mass against the workers. Russia, however, lags behind; and her economic backwardness is reflected in her mediaeval system of government. Hence in the other nations of Western Europe a straight fight is possible between the proletariat and the capitalist ruling class; whilst in Russia the rising capitalist class has yet its emancipation from Autocracy to accomplish: so that, in contrast with practically the whole of civilised nations, the working class and the capitalist class in Russia have, in the abolition of Tsardom's tyranny, a step to go together. This historical circumstance, which is at once the strength and weakness of the Russian movement, distinguishes it from that of all capitalist countries.

The Nature of the Struggle.

No Socialist, therefore, can withhold his sympathy from the great struggle of the Russian people for the elements of political liberty, and all must heartily wish that the great barrier to economic and political progress, Tsardom, may be speedily broken down.

It is satisfactory to note that, in the present communication from the Bureau the idea (which was so common at an earlier period of the revolution, and which was proclaimed by many who called themselves Socialists) that out of the ruins of Tsarist Russia the Socialist Republic would arise, is absent; whilst the elements of political liberty, the creation of a Constituent Assembly, or at most the inauguration of a Russian Republic, are taken for granted as the probable outcome of the present struggle. It has been insisted upon in these columns that the Socialist Republic cannot be the outcome of the defeat of autocracy in Russia because the economic elements are lacking or insufficiently developed. As Marx said: "No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and the new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have been matured in the womb of the old society." The industrial development of Russia is still in its infancy, and vigorous though the infant may be, the greater part of the empire is yet untrodden by it. It is indeed probable that whatever government succeeds that of the Tsar will be compelled,

if only to appease the peasants—the bulk of the nation—to bring about that most reactionary state of things in which the land is split up among the peasants as their private property.

The Driving Forces.

But the student who watches with a little emotion as possible the flowing tide of social life, is sickened at noting for how little human suffering and human blood count in great social movements, and how often the masses of the people have been struggling and fighting for a victory the fruits of which when won are not for them; and the present case appears to be but another illustration of this sad fact. The Russian revolution is a struggle, headed at first by the capitalist middle-class, for the free and untrammelled development of capitalism; and, as in former revolutions, it is the proletariat which later forces on the hesitating bourgeoisie to the completion of their revolutionary work. The hesitancy of the capitalist class is natural under the circumstances. They have an unholy fear of the proletariat which is only a degree less than their fear of the Autocracy that is throttling them.

We have misgivings, however, that the Russian working-class movement, not fully conscious of its mission, will lose its identity in the struggle for middle-class emancipation, and be absorbed by the party of the small capitalist, so that after having been the cat-paw of the middle-class, the proletariat will have to start afresh the work of educating and organising the workers for their own great battle. Nevertheless the struggle must go on, even though the spoils of victory go to the capitalist class, freed from autocratic restrictions and oppression, and the workers, who remain wage-slaves and subjected, have only started on the road to their emancipation, have only cleared away one enemy in order to have a straight fight with the other whom their victory has placed in power.

The Duty of the Socialist.

Let us then do all in our power to help our Socialist comrades in Russia in the hope that they will not be deceived as to the outcome of the present upheaval: in the hope, also, that they will sternly keep their separate identity and distinct aim, so that the Russian bourgeoisie State of to-morrow may find a militant class-organisation of Socialist workers heading the final struggle against the capitalist class whose defeat must herald the triumph of Humanity.

In the body of the Manifesto all Socialists are urged, innocently enough, to bring pressure to bear on their governments to prevent the lending of money "at high interest" to the Government of Russia. Our Russian comrades have an object lesson close at hand as to the value of bringing pressure to bear on a government with any other object than that of defeating it. It is to be feared that the recommendation rests on a misapprehension. If the Socialists in any country are doing their duty in waging incessant war with all their power upon the capitalist government, it should be clear that the Government, knowing that the Socialists as soon as they can defeat them will immediately do so, will pay no attention to Socialist threats

and will not yield to pressure in any particular except to superior force or for their own interests, being aware that the Socialists are doing their worst all the time and can do no more. It is conceivable that the capitalist class would, in order to get the support of some or all of the Socialists, or to avoid being defeated by them, make some small effort to get that support or avoid that defeat. But a Socialist movement which supports Capitalism ceases to be Socialist. The movement which begs a crumb when it has power to take its fill is—well! words fail to describe it. The spectacle of Socialists attempting to prevent the capitalist class lending money at high interest is pitifully amusing. The capitalist class would buy shares in hell itself, if hell could pay a dividend! In this connection the only word for the Socialist to concern himself in is the taking from the capitalist class the power to lend at all.

International Socialist Bureau,
"Maison du Peuple," Brussels.

TO THE WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES.

In spite of his given word, Nicholas II, twice perjured Tsar, has dissolved the Duma as he had violated the constitution of Finland. After having concentrated his troops in St. Petersburg and forced the deputies to disperse, he has, to draw away the attention of Europe, issued a manifesto of which each word is an untruth. He accuses the Duma of having committed illegal acts, after having illegally imposed the fundamental laws upon it, contrary to his promises of the 30th October. He accuses it of incompetence, after having refused it any power, after having compelled it to be but a tribune, which has served, at least, to denounce the crimes of the bureaucracy. He reproaches it with having done nothing, after having made it impossible for it to realise a single parliamentary act.

International Socialism will not lose its time in vain protestations. It is to the action of all that it once more appeals.

The new outrage of the man of the 22nd January has not at all surprised the Socialist Party and does not find it unprepared. The Duma was doomed as soon as the clique of secret councillors, the officials and Grand Dukes, saw the weakness of the majority of the assembly; and the latter, despite the efforts of the Social Democratic and Labour Groups, has followed tactics which could but weaken it.

An odiously restrictive electoral regime, administrative pressure of the most shameless kind exercised on the voting, popular suspicion keeping from the ballot boxes the few proletarians who had access to them; all this had created a fictitious majority which in no wise represented the aspirations of the majority of the country. The elected of the liberal bourgeoisie have themselves proved, by their attitude after the dissolution, that they were wrong to show themselves vacillating before the government, and hesitating before the most urgent reforms. Have they not lost the confidence of the peasants by promising only an insufficient agrarian reform, the adoption of which would not have restored the land to the people of the country districts? Have they not

discontented the workmen in offering miserable palliatives to them instead of fundamental reforms? Have they not deceived all those who ardently aspired to liberty, by not knowing how to be firm and energetic respecting the amnesty, the pogroms, and the death penalty? And in spite of their repeated declamations of loyalty, the Tsar has had nothing but contempt for them. At the opening of Parliament he praised the fundamental laws before them, and, during the whole of the session, he refused them everything. At last, when by their own fault they found themselves without support and without power, they were dispersed without effort like dead leaves before the winds of Autumn.

The consequence of the *coup d'état* of Nicholas II will be to compel the liberal bourgeoisie to abandon the phase of speechmaking and to choose between absolutism and revolution. Compromises and delays are henceforth done with. After recent experience the most naively optimistic must be convinced that it is useless to try to conciliate contraries. The creation of a Duma without power of executive could not prevent the bureaucracy from pillaging the public treasury, from starving the peasantry, from organising with the pecuniary assistance of the occidental bourgeoisie, massacres and outrages upon the liberty of the workmen.

But the revolution does not founder with the Duma. The revolution, on the contrary, enters upon a new phase, more decisive. Before putting an end to the parliamentary comedy, Nicholas II consummated the financial and economic ruin of his empire. He killed the idea of a constitutional Tsarism in the minds of the conservative classes. He opened the eyes of the peasants in refusing them the land. He rallied a portion of the navy and army to the cause of the people, who, after having ascertained the impotence of the liberal bourgeoisie, come again on the scene, grouped under the flag of Socialism. As at the beginning of the struggle it is the proletariat that leads, in the front rank, the struggle against absolutism. With the workmen of the towns, the peasants are joining, who understand better each day that only that union can give them the land, and so also are the intellectuals, more permeated under the flag of Socialism. As at the beginning of the struggle it is the proletariat that leads, in the front rank, the struggle against absolutism. With the workmen of the towns, the peasants are joining, who understand better each day that only that union can give them the land, and so also are the intellectuals, more permeated under the flag of Socialism. As at the beginning of the struggle it is the proletariat that leads, in the front rank, the struggle against absolutism. With the workmen of the towns, the peasants are joining, who understand better each day that only that union can give them the land, and so also are the intellectuals, more permeated under the flag of Socialism.

Two armies thus find themselves henceforth face to face: the army of the Tsar and the army of the people, and between these two, whose conflict is inevitable, victory will be by so much the more decisive for us as the revolution will have been better able to concentrate its forces, realise a unity of action, and utilise more abundant resources.

The revolution, commenced by the strike, will, at the proper time, be pursued by the strike, by refusal of taxation and of military service, by the occupation of the lands of the crown, of the aristocracy, and of the church, by armed revolt with the aid of the soldiers and sailors whom the Socialist propaganda daily wins to the new ideas. It will be pursued without truce and without weakness until the day when Tsarism, having neither troops nor money, neither credit nor power of any sort, the people will be at last masters of their own destinies.

The past of the Russian Socialists speaks for the future. They will know how to compel the convocation of a Constituent Assembly, and to do their duty to the end. Let us know how to do ours. We can aid in the common work by two means: BY PREVENTING THE AUTOCRACY PROCURING MONEY, AND BY SENDING MONEY TO THE SOCIALISTS OF RUSSIA.

The radical government of France, the reactionary government of Germany, the capitalist class of all countries, have made themselves the accomplices of the Tsar in lending to him at high interest the pay of his gendarmes, of his executioners, and of his black bands. Let us bring pressure to bear on the governments to put an end to their compliance! Let us warn the possessing class that the Russian Republic of to-morrow will not pay the infamous debts which the Tsar contracts in order to hire assassins! Let us rally all useful support to the cause of liberty to the end that millions of men may be delivered from an inalienable tyranny. And if, contrary to all expectation, the Holy Alliance of the international reaction attempted to intervene in the conflict in order to break the revolutionary effort

and save the Tsarist oppression, let us know how to take the necessary measures to effectively help the people of Russia, who, united still closely in that conjuncture, would make no distinction between Tsarism, already stricken to its death, and the foreign invader, guilty of attempting to outrage the autonomy of a nation conscious of its rights. Let us give, then, and give generously! Let the accumulated pence of the poor decide the victory!

Let the pass word be: MONEY FOR THE VICTIMS OF TSARISM.

Let each Socialist, let each worker, send his mite, be it to the central organisation of his party, be it to the authorised delegates of our Russian comrades, or to the Secretariat of the International Socialist Bureau.

DOWN WITH AUTOCRACY!

LONG LIVE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM!

The Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau (Belgium).
EDOUARD ANSELE, EMILE VANDERVELDE,
CAMILLE HUYSMANS, Secretary.

MR. BRYAN AND THE TRUSTS.

WHEN, at the end of August, Mr. Bryan, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency of the United States, returned from his tour of the world, he made a remarkable speech that should have been commented on in these columns before. He stated that "Landlordism was the curse of Europe, but it was an innocent institution compared with the trust system carried to its logical conclusion. . . . He hoped the trusts would be exterminated root and branch."

He declared that the time was ripe for the overthrow of plutocracy, which, he asserted, was already sapping the strength of the nation, vulgarising social life, and making a mockery of morals. . . . But the most remarkable aspect of the matter is what is described by the *Tribune* as a "remarkably effective method of dealing with the monopolist trust." The method as explained in the same organ is "that where a trust has achieved an internal monopoly in production the tariff wall should be broken down so as to admit of foreign competition. Free trade in trust articles is an adroit, a politic, and a just proposal. A capitalistic society is tolerable only when free competition protects the public interests. . . . When once the trust system has been formed, State ownership is indeed the only tolerable alternative to competition. Mr. Bryan's scheme is ingenious and economically sound. Its failure would mean, we imagine, the growth of some third party, with a definitely socialistic aim."

The third party has already grown in anticipation of the failure of any scheme of the nature of Mr. Bryan's. I wonder if the writer of the above quoted article has forgotten the Tobacco War, or whether he learned the lesson that had to teach? The entry into British markets of the products of the American Tobacco Trust, had its first effect in bringing British tobacco manufacturers together into the Imperial Tobacco Company. The two trusts did not compete long—they combined; and to-day the Imperial Tobacco Company and the American Tobacco Trust are a united body. May we not expect the same thing to happen in America. The only foreign competition the trust could feel would be that of an organisation sufficiently strong to bear the disadvantages of the extra cost of transit involved. It would have to be a case of the American trust *v.* a Foreign trust. Such a battle of the giants would not last long and would most certainly result in the achievement of the next step in economic progress after the National trust, *viz.* the International trust. The "only tolerable alternative" to which will be State ownership when the State has been democratised. We seem indeed to be approaching the beginning of the end. D.K.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY AND TRADE UNIONISM.

The report of the Party discussion on this subject has been unavoidably held over until our next issue.

DEBATE ON INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM.

(Continued from the October issue.)

Geis in his second speech said that up to a certain point he agreed with Fitzgerald—indeed, Fitzgerald with his wider and more intimate knowledge of Trade Unionism, would make a better Advocate of Industrial Unionism than he (Geis) himself. The adoption of the Preamble was not sufficient of itself; if the material to support it were not present in the working class it was useless. The passing of pious resolutions, of course, did not signify; but they had to recognise what was vital in the principle laid down.

The effort being made was honest; and though the organisation he was representing might fail the principle would live—the principle that would establish Socialism. The working class had evolved to a certain stage, and different degrees of class-consciousness were observable everywhere in its members. The theory of the Industrial Unionist was that Socialism had so penetrated the working-class mind that the elements were now ready to organise on the lines he proposed. Fitzgerald had urged that the I.W.W. should call itself Socialist; if it were Socialist; but the I.W.W. had to be considered not for what it called itself but for what it actually was—a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. It had to be judged not by its name, but by its principles and action. With regard to the statements of Klenensic at the Chicago Convention, it was not at all unlikely that he was only in the position of a man who was for the time being rather puzzled by the clause under discussion. The I.W.W. included members of the Socialist Party, the Socialist Labour Party and others of no political affiliation whatsoever. Affiliation with either of the parties mentioned would only result in the promotion of discord. They were doing their best under the circumstances to unite the working-class politically by first uniting them industrially, in the firm belief that political disunity was the outcome of economic disorganisation. The existing political divisions in the working-class were clearly the shadow of their conflicting economic organisations [This argument Geis illustrated thus: If in the sunlight he held out his hand and extended his fingers, the shadow would show divisions; but by closing up his fingers the shadow would be an undivided one.] That was why the I.W.W. refrained from affiliation with any existing political organisation. There were those who had not yet emancipated their minds from the metaphysical method of reasoning. [Here Geis read a very long extract from Engels' "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific," with the object of proving that Fitzgerald was a metaphysical reasoner.] The working-class was always in fluid motion; its activities could not be frozen; so sure as organic bodies grow, the working class would attain its emancipation through Industrial Unionism.

FITZGERALD emphatically denied that he in any sense, or up to any point, had advocated mere Industrial Unionism, in which he had no faith. He had advocated Socialist Unionism, and no other. And in doing so he had dealt with facts; his arguments were entirely along dialectical lines; not a single example had been adduced to show that his reasoning was dialectically incorrect. He also would refer to Engels' "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific," at p. 75 especially, where Engels indicates that the proletariat will emancipate itself by *seizing political power* from the exploiting class and abolishing the class State. Although the I.W.W. was represented to be a single union it already showed a strong tendency to simulate the craft unions in its devotion into thirteen sub-divisions, quite regardless of the original seven-division "wheel" described by Haggerty. Thus the I.W.W. had obviously not themselves realised the class form of industrial organisation. He (Fitzgerald) was in favour of industrial organisation on a class basis, as opposed to the sectional basis, of the I.W.W. How was it possible to overthrow the Capitalist system, and "take and hold" the means of existence, merely by industrial organisation? The seizure of land by the unemployed at West Ham afforded a miniature illustration of what would happen on a vast scale if the absurd attempt were made. In the one case the police and fire-brigade sufficed to com-

pel the unemployed to relinquish their hold on an acre of land; in the event of a greater attempt by Industrial Unionists they would be confronted by all the armed forces at the command of the dominant class. The key to the position, as Engels had shown, was to obtain control of the fighting forces through the wresting of political authority from the possessing class. This was not a question of honesty, but of right and wrong; and the I.W.W., by its proposal to "take and hold" by economic action alone, was simply misleading the working class. Political parties, moreover, were not a reflection of economic organisations, but the recognition and expression of economic interests. It was all very well to say in the Preamble that the I.W.W. did not countenance political affiliation; it left political action out altogether. Why, if economic unity promoted political unity, were such prominent advocates of Industrial Unionism as E. V. Debs and Daniel DeLeon still in political opposition? why generally were its members at each other's throats in the political field? Only a clear understanding of their class position could bring about the political unity of the working class; and so rapid was the development of economic conditions at the present time that all confusing and misleading proposals should be strenuously opposed, and the only way pointed out to the workers along the lines of Socialism and Socialism alone.

Geis observed that the members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain were obsessed with the idea of an armed Revolution; they could not conceive the possibility of a peaceful revolution, and therefore they insisted on the necessity of the control by the workers of the armed forces of the nation. Their eyes were full of the blood of the French Revolution. Unless the workers were industrially organised a bloody revolution would undoubtedly occur. He would point out that the soldiers engaged in the Featherstone shooting travelled by the aid of the craft unionists, who also supplied them with hats, boots, and clothes. If the workers were class-conscious the military would not be so supplied, nor with bayonets, bullets and "grab." The armed force argument therefore fell to the ground. The whole working class would have to be industrially organised however, before it could complete its mission; but when that organisation was accomplished, the armed forces would not be able to move a hair's breadth. The ballot-box method was a proved failure. The Russian revolutionaries were shot down notwithstanding the election of the Duma. With regard to the thirteen sub-divisions of the I.W.W., criticised by Fitzgerald, these did not constitute craft unions; they were geographical divisions having local autonomy, but were subject to a central board. In this matter the I.W.W. submitted to circumstances they could not overcome, and Fitzgerald had elaborated no alternative scheme. Only by such industrial organisation as that he advocated would the workers accomplish the Social Revolution.

FITZGERALD replied that the emancipation of the working class was an impossibility until they were organised politically and economically. He had pointed out that although according to the Preamble of the I.W.W. the workers must come together on the political as on the economic field, two delegates at the Chicago convention of the I.W.W. had revealed the hopeless political confusion and class-unconsciousness of the members of that body, and the statements of those delegates were not repudiated. Neither had Geis made the least attempt to meet the question raised, which was essential. He (Fitzgerald) had every reason to desire a peaceful revolution, but the history of class-antagonisms and the circumstances of modern times provided him with but little hope in that direction. By repudiating the ballot-box method Geis had simply taken the Anarchist position; and assuredly if the efforts of the I.W.W. were non-political they were also non-Socialist. Apparently Geis had never heard of soldiers being employed on railways, of the storage of seven years' munitions of war and other such provisions. Finally he reasserted that a Socialist Preamble did not make a Socialist organisation, either in the case of a "pure and simple" craft union or the I.W.W. And his denial that that body was a Socialist Union implied also his opinion that it was not worthy the confidence and support of the working class.

PROPAGANDA IN THE PROVINCES.

A CYCLING DIARY.

When I arranged to spend a week of my fortnight's holiday in pushing the interests of the S.P.G.B., I expected to have either the redoubtable J. Kay or some other valiant and experienced comrade as a companion for my cycling tour, commencing August 11th; but some unkind strokes of Fate prevented that expectation being realised, and I had to sally forth alone.

I am asked to write an account of my tour, and to do it briefly, so in order to fulfil this condition, I am putting my experiences in diary form.

Saturday, Aug. 11. Had my first day's riding—53 miles against a stiff wind. Reached Bedford at noon. Was unable to hold meeting here, no pitch being available: tried to secure stall in the market for sale of literature, but failed, so had to be content with looking up a few old friends and disposing of a Manifesto or Standard where I could.

Sunday, Aug. 12.—Reached Northampton at 11 a.m. and proceeded to the Market Square. The local branch of the S.D.F. presently put in an appearance and started their meeting, during which I got amongst the audience with the literature, the result being that the people had parted with their spare coppers before *Justice* came on the scene. The speaker urged his hearers never to support Liberal or Tory candidates, and when question time came I asked him why the S.D.F. branches had frequently supported Liberal candidates and also why they had done it in Northampton. After a brief consultation the chairman dealt with the question, or rather made a long rambling statement in which he admitted that the S.D.F. in Northampton made a grave mistake, but defended the action taken in support of Naoroji in Lambeth and generally defended the go-as-you-please policy which has characterised the actions of his organisation during the last few years. The meeting was then closed (although I had intimated my intention of offering opposition) but fortunately the crowd remained, and I dealt as fully as time allowed with the differences between the S.D.F. and the S.P.G.B. Literature sales:—Manifestoes 13, Standards 25.

Monday, Aug. 13.—After a delightful ride to Leicester, and an equally delightful rest when I arrived there, I opened out in the market-place at 7.45 under rather trying circumstances. I had a very vigorous evangelist in close proximity to my meeting, and a band playing sufficiently near to draw the usual market-place crowd. Socialist propaganda is badly needed here, in fact there did not seem to be any one present among my questioners who had got much further than Labourism (dependent or independent according to circumstances). One friend—whom I judged to be an I.L.P. man—seemed very wrath at my attack on the L.R.C. and his idol Ramsay MacDonald, and whilst we were engaged in a little argument as to whether J. R. M. is, or is not a Socialist, an incident occurred which made myself and every one in the crowd (except my opponent) laugh very heartily. Along comes a young man who has not heard the discussion, but hears me use the sentence, "the only hope of the people lies in a social revolution"; working his way to the front of the meeting, he shouts, "We don't want you Socialists down here—we've got MacDonald!" After this I did not think it necessary to follow the matter further as it seemed that, whatever the local Labour Party may claim, the "man in the street" does not look upon Mr. MacDonald as a representative of Socialism.

Several other questions were asked and answered—mostly from the reform point of view—and a fairly good meeting was brought to a close at 9.30. Literature sales: Manifestoes, 14; Standards 25.

Tuesday, Aug. 14. This was a blank day so far as propaganda was concerned, owing to the fact that my bag, which had been sent on, had not arrived at Loughborough where I had intended holding a meeting. No literature, no meeting.

Wednesday, Aug. 15. This was the first wet day of my tour, but the weather was fair when

I reached Derby, and hoisted my poster on to the statue railings in the market place. Here I met the Secretary of the Woodwich I.L.P., who was holiday-making like myself, and also a prominent member of the local Socialist Party. Whilst in argument with them preparatory to commencing the meeting, the rain began to fall in torrents, and continued for about twenty minutes. When it was fine enough to venture forth from shelter I found that someone had commandeered the box which I had at much difficulty secured as my platform, also, at the same time, some papers which the box contained. This and the prospect of further rain made me decide to give up the meeting. Sales: Manifestoes, 6; Standards, 3.

Thursday, Aug. 16. Nottingham. Here the weather looked very threatening but about 7.30 it cleared up and was beautifully fine. I consulted a policeman as to the best place for holding my meeting—the market-place being quite covered with stalls. Robert was very polite and indicated the bottom of Derby Road as the best pitch, but added that I had better be careful as to what I said, as he had seen many a speaker upset the crowd and be glad to escape by hopping on to a tramcar. However, I held a meeting from 7.45 until 10.20, an hour being taken up with answering questions which were very numerous and varied in character, but fortunately were asked at the proper time and in decent order. This was one of the best audiences it has ever been my pleasure to address, and I am hoping to visit Nottingham again shortly (with a companion for preference). Literature sales:—Manifestoes, 27; Standards, 42.

Friday, Aug. 17. I had promised to hold another meeting in Nottingham; but it rained hard the whole evening.

Saturday, Aug. 18th. Kettering. Weather improving, and had a delightful ride here from Nottingham. My experience here was not very gratifying, as I made two attempts to get a decent meeting in the market-place, but without success. The first time, the Band came along and effectually silenced me; on the second occasion, a smart glee-party came along and captured my crowd. I had one rather rude young fellow who several times interrupted me and who at length shouted, "You think you're clever, mister, but you only evolved from a monkey!" When I replied by asking him if he could give me any idea as to when the process of evolution from monkeyhood would commence in his case, he sobered down somewhat, and, in a few minutes, disappeared. Literature sales:—Manifestoes, 6; Standards, 7.

Sunday, Aug. 19. Ride to Luton with the intention of holding a meeting at night; but literature had not turned up and two bands were busy in the town so the idea had to be given up.

From which it seems
The best laid schemes
Of F. E. D.
Oft gang agley.

My tour concluded with a delightful ride home *via* Hatfield, Hertford, Waltham, High Beech and Woodford.

Next year I hope to do something rather more ambitious with the assistance of a good speaker. There is excellent scope for our propaganda in Leicester and Nottingham, and a "Party Outing" to Nottingham by one of the Sunday League trains is worth consideration from a propaganda point of view. Any members anxious to distinguish themselves in this way can at any time rely upon the presence and support of

F. E. D.

THE S.P.G.B. AND THE S.L.P.

G. Geis writes at considerable length challenging the statement made by J. Fitzgerald in our last issue that he (Fitzgerald) asked Geis to stay away from the Cock & Hoop meeting. The matter is extraneous to the article we published in the August number, and in no way affects the position of the S.P.G.B. It was introduced by a correspondent whose letter appeared last month, and is at most a question of personal recollection, with which we have nothing to do.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2 0
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5 6
Half Column do.	...	0	10 0
One Column do.	...	1	0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.

SATURDAY, NOV. 3, 1906.



TEN MILLIONS STARVING.

Mr. Lloyd-George spoke strongly at Penrhyn-dendraith, Merioneth, last night.

"He said there were ten millions in this country enduring year after year the torture of living on, lacking a sufficiency of the bare necessities of life; and all this existed amid a splendid plenty which poured into a land so wealthy that it could afford to lend out of its spare riches thousands of millions to less well-endowed lands in other parts of the world.

"There is plenty of wealth in this country to provide for all and to spare," he continued. "What is wanted is a fairer distribution. There is a good deal of temporary depression in the slate industry in this part of the world, which I trust will soon pass away. But before it goes I am afraid there will be much distress from want of employment. Yet there are two men in the county of Carnarvon whose combined incomes are equal to the aggregated earnings of half the quarrymen of the country.

"The latter, working at a skilled trade, requiring years of apprenticeship to master it, risking life in its pursuit—thousands of them together can only earn just as much as two men who do not contribute a single slate to the common stock.

"I do not suggest that there should be a compulsory equal distribution of the wealth of this country between its inhabitants, but I do say that the law which protects these men in the enjoyment of their great possessions should first of all see that those whose labour alone produces their wealth are amply protected from actual need where they are unable owing to circumstances over which they have no control to earn enough to purchase the necessities of life. Daily Express, 26.9.06.

A DANGEROUS GAME.

So truth will out even from a Capitalist Cabinet minister. Ten millions starving: it is a greatly underestimated figure, but it will serve ten millions of those whose labour alone produces the country's wealth! Yet George, like Burns and the rest of the kidney, offers no remedy. Why? Because they dare not. They know the remedy well enough—the only remedy that can be applied, but they fear to speak it.

They will talk sympathetically enough to secure working-class support for the party to which they belong; but they know as they talk that the Party on whose behalf they stand can do nothing to touch the fringe of the evil. Because their party is a Capitalist party, call it by what else they will, and unemployment and its consequent starvation are directly due to the fact that the working class whose labour alone—on the word of a Cabinet minister—produces wealth, depend for their bread to-day upon whether the capitalist class can make a profit out of the purchase of their labour power. The Capitalist class live upon profits—nothing else. Without profits they must die. Because of profits the workers must live precarious lives and starve by the tens of millions. Very well. The cure rests solely in the extinction of the profit-monger, the abolition of the capitalist class; the expropriation of the expropriators, and the death of the political expression of capitalism, of which Lloyd George and Co. constitute themselves the fagmen. Let Mr. Lloyd George tell the whole truth if he dare. As it is he is a sort of political Pied Piper—a lure; a decoy. But he must be careful. The game he is playing is a dangerous one. If the workers produce all the wealth it may occur that a reminder of it from a cabinet minister will have the effect of inspiring in the minds of the wealth producers a dissatisfaction with anything less than the entire product of their labour. And what Lloyd George of all the hosts of capitalist apologists—highly paid or lowly—would venture to dispute the justice of the demand after such a ministerial pronouncement as was made in that Merioneth town of the unpronounceable name.

JUSTICE OR JAUNDICE.

Our respected contemporary the organ of the S.D.F. has replied to a correspondent thus:—"We have neither the space nor the inclination to reply to the slanders of insignificant creatures who only maintain a temporary and parasitical vitality by venomous attacks on the S.D.F. Such attacks are usually absurd and always beneath notice. The statement in question is absolutely untrue. Lady Warwick has never been to a meeting in Battersea nor been invited to a meeting there, nor sent a telegram to any meeting there."

Not being in the confidence of the Editor we cannot, of course, say definitely who these slanders are who maintain a parasitical vitality upon the S.D.F., although there is good evidence for supposing that they are leading members of the I.L.P. who, we notice, are rather given to expressing themselves in terms intended to be hurtful to the feelings of leading S.D.F. men. But if this is to maintain a parasitical vitality on the S.D.F., the I.L.P. may fairly retort that the vitality of the S.D.F. (assuming its existence) has been derived parasitically from the I.L.P., seeing how readily S.D.F. leaders and the S.D.F. organ (which isn't the S.D.F.'s) fall to giving forcible tongue to their detestation of the I.L.P. But however this may be, and whoever may be the slanders in question, we suggest in all friendliness that the Justice writer should endeavour to prevent his anger (even the artificially stimulated variety) betraying him into venomous attacks—particularly upon insignificant creatures. Vulgar abuse is no argument, and the slanderer does not strengthen his position by reducing himself to the level of the slanderer. As it is, the language of the paragraph, common as we are afraid we must say it is in our contemporary, impels the idea that there is some peculiar quality in the literary atmosphere of Clerkenwell Green which prevents a man expressing himself—upon certain subjects at any rate—in any other than cultured Billingsgate. We confess we know of no other spot in the British Isles so apparently provocative of adjectival splenetics excepting always, of course, Edinburgh!

ON MISREPRESENTATION.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, however, we have considerable sympathy with Justice in its protest against misrepresentation and abuse the more because we are ourselves heavy sufferers

from the same cause. Throughout the whole course of our short history we have been made the subject of as much vilification, misrepresentation, and all the other "ations" of contemptuous and vituperative reference, as any party ever was, or, probably ever will be, with results which must have been detrimental to our progress as a Party seeing that we are, in the nature of things, unable to overtake in order to effectively combat, as we can, every product of the tongue and pen of malice, envy, and uncharitableness. Nevertheless, we can say as Justice with honesty cannot, that we have within the limits of our opportunities, dealt with our slanderers and shown them to be such unmistakably. Justice, on the other hand, has preferred we have observed, to complain of slander without attempting to show wherein the slander consisted. This is, of course, by far the safer method when the alleged slander embodies the inconvenient truth; but unless Justice can succeed in fooling all its readers all the time, it is a method that will, sooner or later bring the grey hairs of Justice in sorrow to the grave. However,

"While the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return."

And there is still the chance that Justice will repent.

For the present, as it has been represented to us that the statement respecting Lady Warwick may be regarded as in the nature of a reply to the note on the same matter which appeared in the June number of this journal, we will content ourselves with pointing out—

- (1) that we never said Lady Warwick was invited to attend a meeting at Battersea;
- (2) that we never said Lady Warwick attended a meeting there: but we did say that
- (3) Lady Warwick sent a telegram to John Burns' meeting there regretting her inability to be present and we gave our evidence for the statement—evidence that Justice will have to meet if it wants to deal with the point at all.

So that (assuming that the reference was, as suggested, to our statement) Justice has missed three chances of stating the truth upon this particular matter and only escaped missing a fourth by the fact that a fourth was never presented to it!

Still we make no doubt that presently we shall have it laid to our charge that we did deliberately and of malice aforethought malign Our Lady of Warwick and other comrades "who have borne the heat and burden of the day" (!) by bearing false witness against them in this connection.

I. S. B.

Brussels, October, 1906.

DEAR COMRADE,—

The plenary assembly of the International Socialist Bureau will take place on Saturday, November 10th, at the Secretary's Office of the I.S.B. (Brussels, People's Palace, 17, Joseph Steven's-street, 1st story, room 6), at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

AGENDA:

1. The organisation and agenda of the International Socialist Congress of Stuttgart (August, 1907).
2. Second examination of Van Kol's proposition concerning the International Congresses and the I.S.B.
3. The rules of the Parliamentary Socialist and Labour Commission.

The Executive Committee:

ANSELE, VANDERVELDE, HUYSMANS.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

FRED. W. TOD.—Had hoped to print and deal with your letter in this issue but pressure prevents. Both letter and answer wait but for the psychological moment!

W. S. JERMAN.—Your letter is largely a reiteration and contains no new point of importance. If you have any material criticism to offer we will be pleased to deal with it. But always remember that brevity is a sign of grace in a correspondent. You might easily have compressed your five pages into one and the matter would have benefited by the attention. Your desire to speak the truth only is laudable, but, unless you wish us to think it exceptional, hardly worth mentioning. We credit all our correspondents with the same desire. However, keep the desire alive and vigorous. It will help you to admit your error frankly (on points of journalistic method for example) when you know better.

KARL KAUTSKY on SOCIALISM and TRADE UNIONISM.

At the Annual Congress of the German Socialists held during the last week of September, the most important questions discussed were the "Relations of the Socialist Party to the Trade Unions," and "The Political General Strike." The Executive and General Councils of the Party submitted a resolution (introduced by Bebel) which was drawn up so as to fully satisfy those elements in the Trade Unions and the Socialist Party that believed in the Trade Unions having a free hand in their actions, while being expected to co-operate with each other when mutually deemed practicable and advantageous.

Kautsky and 32 other comrades moved as an amendment the following addition:

"In order, however, to insure on the part of the Trade Unions together with the Party uniformity of thought and action, which is an indispensable condition for the victorious progress of the class-struggle of the Proletariat, it is absolutely necessary that the Trade Unions be dominated by the spirit of Socialism. It is therefore the duty of every member of the Party to act in this sense within the Trade Unions, and to consider himself bound by the resolutions of the Party Congresses in his actions in Trade Unions as well as in all others of a public character. This is demanded in the interest of the Trade Union movement itself, as the Socialist movement is the highest and most far-reaching form of the class-struggle of the proletariat, and no working-class organisation, no working-class movement can completely accomplish its aims unless it is permeated by the spirit of Socialism."

In support of the foregoing amendment Kautsky said:

As to our proposed addendum, which the Executive decline to support, I must confess that their action has disappointed me very much. I thought that in that addition we said nothing that should not be self-understood by every comrade, and that one cannot reject what is self-understood. I believe that this resolution is necessary as a consequence of the resolution justified by Bebel. I consider that resolution to be incomplete. If our addendum is not accepted what does Bebel's resolution say? It recognises that it is necessary to take, from time to time, action together with the Trade Unions. I am fully convinced that the joint action of the Party and the Trade Unions must be the future form of action. Bebel recognises that the form of future action must be that the functionaries of the Trade Unions in every case arrive at an understanding. But here the resolution ends. Yet here only begins the difficulty. Then the question arises, what happens if such understanding is not come to? The reply is very simple. If it does not come to an understanding, it does not come to action. How can we come to action? Our own Party has, the larger it has grown, become in a certain sense an awkward apparatus. It is not easy to bring new ideas into that apparatus. And should the case arise that the Trade Unions are wanting a rest, what prospects would there open up before us by the Trade Unions hanging on as a brake to the already so awkward party organisation. And just because we recognise that we have in each case to co-operate with the Trade Unions it becomes necessary for us to see to it that the Trade Unions should be composed of such elements as to ever make it impossible for these Unions to act as brakes upon the Party. And therefore it is the duty of the Party to deal with the Trade Unions in such a way as to prevent them from hampering the Party. That that should be done in the interest of the Party requires no explanation. The question, however, may be raised—and I believe that is the reason for opposing our addendum whether the Trade Unions would not suffer by this joint action: whether the Socialist propaganda would do harm to the Trade Unions? I am of the opinion that the Trade Unions would lose nothing but on the contrary that they would profit by such action, because they would thereby be enabled to accomplish their great task. And now only I come to the point I was really

anxious to make clear. It is the question whether it would be detrimental to the Trade Unions if they acted in the spirit of Socialism, I deny its being detrimental. Upon what are based the powers of the Trade Unions to attract members? Firstly, upon their system of mutual benefits and, secondly upon the character of a fighting organisation. Now the system of mutual benefits is such as to limit the power of the Trade Unions to attract members very considerably. By the offer of mutual benefits the Trade Unions reach but a small circle of the workers. That is proved by the position of Trade Unions in England. The benefits granted, the amount fixed for the same and those for contributions, depend upon the wages of the contributors. The greater the amounts of benefit granted the more the Trade Unions get confined to such of the workers as may receive high wages. That is proved by the Trade Unions in England, which for the last ten years have been in a state of stagnation while the membership of the German Trade Unions has increased by leaps and bounds.

And why is that? The English workers themselves have recognised that. They have themselves said that the English Trade Unions are decaying because they have not the Socialists which should imbue them with the Socialist spirit. What is the difference between the English working-class movement and the German? The English working-class movement has the benefit system much better organised than the German workers have, because there is no State Insurance in England, and in spite of the superior benefit system the English Trade Unions are in a state of stagnation. In England we have the neutrality of the Trade Unions, they are lacking Socialist principles and that proves that it is Socialism which has caused the progress of the German Trade Unions. Socialists have founded the German Trade Unions, Socialists are its administrators, and it is the Socialists who have imparted to these Unions the vigour they possess. No party in Germany commands such respect as the Socialist Party. The German Socialist Party is the representative of all the exploited—of all men and women who are up in arms against the present system of exploitation. And the free Trade Unions may show themselves ever so free and neutral, yet they are regarded by the mass of the people to be Socialist. That is fortunate for the Free Trade Unions, for the entire confidence which the mass of the people bestow upon the Socialist Party they also place in the Trade Unions and that constitutes the main strength of the Trade Unions. If we push that more in the future we shall only increase the power of attraction of the Trade Unions. With the power of attraction is closely related the Party discipline. If we create a class of comrades for whom that discipline does not exist: we only weaken what is the strongest lever of the class-struggle of the proletariat, which is the greatest help to the Trade Unions themselves. We must under all conditions insist upon Party discipline. The Trade Unions will not fare badly upon observing it. The Socialist Party has never passed a Resolution which has injured the Trade Unions or hampered their agitation. After all only such affairs come here into question which enter the sphere of the Trade Unions as well as that of the Party; but if once the case should arise that the Trade Unions should feel themselves injured in their own sphere by a Resolution of the Party, that could only be if the Trade Unions place the particular interests of their members higher than the common interest, and then we should so much more insist upon the common interest being placed higher and that it should prevail. I point to France where for a time a number of comrades were permitted to stand outside Party discipline. When Millerand became Cabinet Minister it was declared: A Cabinet Minister acts under such peculiar conditions that he stands outside Party discipline. That created the category of a comrade on leave for whom the Party discipline does not exist. And soon, also, the members of Parliament took a fancy to that position. They, too, were averse to standing under Party discipline. Finally, also, their constituents declared that there was no need for themselves being obedient to discipline with the result that the solidarity of the Party was with the greatest difficulty sustained by

various amputations and by the expulsion of 18 members of Parliament from the Party. This example should be a warning to us. We must under no circumstances permit that a special class of comrades be created who are given a discipline of their own. I admit that a comrade who is at the same time a Trade Unionist may experience a serious conflict of conscience; but we want to make that impossible by seeing to it that Party and Trade Unions, Party Congress and Trade Union Congress may equally be possessed of the Socialist spirit. What my addendum demands is already being practised in Germany in a number of towns where the members of the Party are zealously active in the Trade Unions as for instance in Hamburg and just there the relations are most harmonious. There the Party as well as the Trade Unions thrive. The addendum contains by no means a declaration of war against the Trade Unions, on the contrary it aims at creating a basis upon which alone successful and uniform action of the Party and Trade Unions together could be made possible.

CORRESPONDENCE.

IS SOCIETY AN ORGANISM?

To the Editor, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.
DEAR COMRADE, It is affirmed by Socialists and others that Society is an organism. If this be true it is evident to me that the reforming or evolutionary Socialist is right when he contends that Socialism can evolve from, and grow up side by side with, Capitalism. For, if human Society is an organism it must be governed by the same evolutionary laws that govern the human being and must be in itself at least as complex as man.

A child born of human parents grows up under their care, is tended by them, evolves to manhood or womanhood and eventually takes the place of its parents in the perpetuating process. Therefore, if society is an organism, we must look to Socialism, as the offspring of Capitalism, to follow the same lines as to both birth and development. That is to say, Socialism, born of its parent Capitalism, must evolve to maturity, side-by-side with, and under the care of, Capitalism, which it will finally supplant in the perpetuation of Society.

If Society is an organism, such a process appears to me not only possible, but inevitable, for an organism must act in accordance with the organic laws of its nature.

By the way, I do not know, when an infant society-organism is born, whether the old society stands merely as mother (in which case I wonder where the father may be found), or whether it serves in the dual capacity of both mother and father.

The analogy of the birth of a child as used by Kautsky, does not apply to the question under discussion. The birth of a child, which he terms a revolution, does not kill the parents (occasional exceptions in the case of the mother recognised) who, as we see, go on living and tending the child to maturity. The birth of Revolutionary Socialism, not as an idea, but as a living entity, would most certainly kill its parent Capitalism. Consequently were Socialism an organism the day of its birth by revolution would be the day of its death, for by analogy, and as an infant society organism, it would require a parent society to take care of it.

Though I have studied the question for some years, I have hitherto been unable to find an atom of evidence to prove that Society is any more of an organism than the Milky Way, a herd of cattle, or a field of cabbage. The word "man" suggests an organism; the words "a society of men" suggests to me a number of these organisms, all of similar organic structure, not an intangible organism arising from their association.

Again reminding you that human Society to be an organism must be as complex and contain the same organic parts as its individual members, I will ask, to where in Society can you point and say, "There are the brains of Society, there are the lungs of Society, there is the heart of Society," and so on.

We know that in Society a deadly struggle has been waged for centuries. What would be

the result to any organism that was continually at war with itself? Complete and utter destruction, and no other organism could arise from its ashes, for it would die long before it reached maturity. The fight that takes place in Society is between organism and organism, not between organic parts of the same organism.

In Society there are two chief parts, sections or classes warring against each other. By Socialists this conflict is termed the "class struggle." But this is not all. These two sections known respectively as the capitalist and working classes, are again further divided and sub-divided until they practically come down to units, each unit fighting desperately against his fellow unit.

I do not know what part of the organism the capitalist represents, but he is fiercely fighting the rest of his own organic division in addition to the working-class section. The working-class part of the organism is engaged in precisely the same game, so that a raging, tearing cross action amongst the individual cells of the organism is ever in progress.

But, and here comes the funny part of the matter, when the class interests of the Capitalists are threatened by the attitude of the working-class section the capitalist units band themselves together for defensive purposes.

That an organism should be divisible into two classes, that it should possess class-interests, or that a fractional part of the organism should be able to maintain any interest whatever apart from the welfare of the rest of the organism, is to me extremely comical. But if in spite of this, Society is an organism, the fact that the capitalist part of it know how to defend their interests would appear to show where the brains of the organism are situated.

But where in the whole of nature may be found an organism the organic parts of which are all of similar structure? Where is the organism that ruthlessly and unceasingly kills off its organic parts and still waxes stronger and stronger?

Where in nature may be found the animal organism in which, say, one third part doing no useful work in the economy of that organism, grows sleek and fat and is able to keep the other two-thirds, which do all the necessary work, unenriched and undeveloped?

Where in nature is to be found the vegetable organism, a third part of which, doing nothing useful in that organism, receives the greater portion of the sap, and the other two-thirds, drawing all the sap from the roots, die for lack of nourishment?

Such monstrosities are to be seen only in nightmares.

We all know that the part of an organism which does not take its proper share in the work of supporting the organism is the part that is undeveloped and unenriched. The reverse is the case in Society.

How then can Society be said to even resemble an organism in any particular.

If my reasoning is unsound, if Society is an organism, then I repeat, the position of the Socialist who asserts that Socialism may be and must be brought a bit at a time is logically unassailable, for that position is strictly in harmony with organic law. The complex animal organism, born of another complex animal organism must in its infancy be attended to, and for a longer or shorter period grow up beside its parents; otherwise it will perish. Therefore, if Socialism is to be born in natural order from Capitalism, the child must live under the care of its parent, or some other similar organism; which, of course, does not exist.

Socialists appear to be oblivious of the fact that the social revolution for which they are working will be something entirely unique in the world's history; though the revolutionary sections are conscious it will require unique efforts to bring it about. Thereby, from the point of view I have laid down, showing that their belief is not in harmony with their base.

Despite all beliefs to the contrary, a new Society has never been born in the whole of the recorded history of civilisation. The infant, Private Ownership, saw the light many centuries ago, and the effects of all revolutions so far have been to change his appearance: to win for him the right to wear a new suit of clothes: to wax his moustache or part his hair in the middle. That is absolutely all that previous revolutions

social, and political, have accomplished. But though Private Ownership is dressed in a different fashion, though he has substituted the frock coat and the tool of industry for the armour and the sword, he is still the same individual in essence as he was on the day of his birth. The storm and stress of the centuries have left their mark upon him, but there's life in the old boy yet, and the numbers of his loyal supporters are as the sands of the sea shore.

Putting metaphor aside, various forms of Society have evolved from their predecessors because they grew from the same base—individual ownership in the means of life. But I submit, it is as absurd to expect collective ownership to evolve directly from private ownership as it would be to expect an acorn to evolve directly into a beech tree. Both the oak and the beech are trees, but they evolve from different bases, and neither can evolve into the other, unless, it may be, by the passage of a long period of time. If the oak is to grow in the ground now occupied by the beech, then the beech must be uprooted before the oak can be planted.

Here we touch upon the essential difference between evolution and revolution, as the latter word is used and understood by Socialists; but as that is not the subject with which we are now dealing, it must be left to another occasion.

I trust I have now said sufficient to show how much depends upon the question as to whether Society is, or is not, an organism. Upon demonstrable proof, one way or the other, hinges the possibility of Socialist unity.

Not only that. If it is proved as I think it may be that the term is merely figurative, then it will be seen that such a base is not the right one upon which to build a scientific thesis, and in consequence, many concepts arising from its assumed truth will have to be reconsidered or abandoned. If the proposition is proved correct, then I, for one, will most readily accept the proof, even though in the process my reasoning faculties are twisted out of shape.

The vital importance I conceive to be attached to this question must be my excuse for the length of this epistle.—Yours fraternally,

H. PHILLIPS WRIGHT.

"TEMPORISING AND REACTIONARY."

A PROMINENT S.D.F. MEMBER'S CRITICISM OF S.D.F. METHODS.

133, Goswell-road, E.C.
31/8/06.

To the Editor, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

DEAR COMRADE.—Could you please find room in your forthcoming issue of the STANDARD for the following letter of resignation of my membership of the S.D.F., addressed to Comrade F. B. Buckeridge, of the Southampton Branch, S.D.F.? I have cancelled all my lecture engagements with the S.D.F. branches.

Yours fraternally,

GUY A. ALDRED.

P.S.—I should be obliged to be supplied with a membership form of the S.P.G.B.

(Copy.)
133, Goswell-road, E.C.
31/8/06.

To Comrade F. B. Buckeridge,

32, St. Andrew's-road, Southampton.

DEAR COMRADE, I had delayed writing to you before, with regard to your request that I should lecture for you on September 9th, next, because I wanted to give you an answer in the affirmative. I have, however, after a careful study of the position, come to the conclusion that the S.D.F., mistaking numbers for efficiency and popularity for sound economics, is not a workers' party. I regret, therefore, that I can no longer speak from the S.D.F. platform; and shall at once resign my membership, and as soon as possible settle my dues to my branch, thus leaving the party in an honourable manner. I shall apply to the Socialist Party of Great Britain for membership.

Yours fraternally,

GUY A. ALDRED.

133, Goswell-road, E.C.

2/9/06.

To the Editor, SOCIALIST STANDARD.

DEAR COMRADE.—After having been, during my membership of the S.D.F., one of the most vigorous opponents of the Party of which the STANDARD is the organ, and having opposed that Party's Principles in a debate with Comrade Fitzgerald, I feel I owe an explanation to your readers for having accepted its principles, even though I may not be allowed to join its ranks. As a matter of fact, however, my acceptance of the revolutionary principles for the inculcation of which your organisation alone among Socialist organisations avowedly stands, represents the maturity of those ideas that first led me to join the S.D.F., and, subsequently, in disgust, to throw up Parliamentary correspondence for *Justice*. I now see quite clearly that a revisionist policy is incompatible with a revolutionary policy and it is because of that fact that the S.D.F. is so unsatisfactory an organisation. I have got about a good deal among its rank-and-file during my membership and I was surprised to find two distinct sets of feelings existing among its members. On the one hand there were the frankly revolutionary spirits, good, earnest, and sincere comrades; on the other, tamerevisionists and mere social reformers. This being so, the organisation, as such, could have no policy, and hence could not be "class-conscious." Now, Comrade, in the past I have accused your Party of merely mouthing the Class War, and have stated that I could do that on the S.D.F. platform. There may be an element of truth in that, but further study has revealed to me this fact, that if I speak on the S.D.F. platform I ought to subscribe to its constitution; and if I did so subscribe, I should have to subscribe to temporising and reactionary political "tactics" such as find practical expression in the case of Mr. W. Thorne, M.P. I cannot honestly do so and preach the Class War; so, although not yet a member of the S.P.G.B. I feel I can no longer honestly mount the S.D.F. platform as a supporter of S.D.F. tactics. Again, recently I initiated a correspondence in *Justice* on why Socialists could not philosophically believe in the capricious effects of prayer nor be Christians. *Justice* indulges in the old cant about "private religious belief." This betrays a desire to negate Marxian economics and philosophic Socialism in order to secure the support of "class-conscious Socialists" save the mark!—like the Rev. Conrad Noel. No! Socialism is not to be established, the workers are not to be emancipated by the revisionist and respectable tactics of official S.D.F.ers. Only when the workers have realised the meaning of class-consciousness will they be emancipated. Meanwhile the class-controllers may be depended upon to delude by granting palliative "reforms" to soften the suffering occasioned by capitalist and class-control of the necessities of existence.

Just now I am booked up for several engagements with comrades in the S.D.F. I admire and respect for their devotion to the cause of working-class emancipation, a devotion wrongly employed in the interest of the revisionists at the head of the S.D.F. I find it hard to cut myself adrift from these colleagues; but I feel I must be true to myself.

In conclusion, therefore, Comrade, let me thank those comrades of the S.P.G.B. who have so persistently brought under my notice the logic of the revolutionary position and also the official abuses existing in the S.D.F. Whatever the future may have in store for me, I shall remember, with gratitude, the services they have rendered me. Thanking you in anticipation, Yours fraternally,

GUY A. ALDRED,
(Late Parliamentary Correspondent to *Justice*.)

[SUBSEQUENT to the receipt of the foregoing article by our correspondent appeared in *Justice* which conveyed the impression that the writer had not clearly apprehended the position of the S.P.G.B. He was written on the subject by the General Secretary of the Party and the following reply was received.]

16/9/06. 133, Goswell-rd., E.C.

To Comrade W. Gifford, Gen. Sec., S.P.G.B.

DEAR COMRADE, Your letter of the 14th inst.

to hand. In reply, I would beg to state that the letter that appeared in *Justice* above my name was sent some days previous to the letter I addressed to the Southampton S.D.F., and a copy of which I addressed to you. At the same time as I addressed this copy to you I addressed another copy of the same letter to the editor of *Justice*, and it is this letter to which reference is made in the editorial comment. When I noticed this fact I addressed a further letter of complaint to the editor of *Justice*; but was informed, by Comrade A. A. Watts, in the communication I enclose, that Quelch could not publish it. These are the facts.

Coming to my attitude at the present time. Briefly, it is this: Socialism, standing for the complete revolution of the present state of Society, can only be realised when the proletariat are educated up to class-consciousness and are thus able to obtain their own emancipation. In the meantime, it is unnecessary for Socialists to ask for or to seek to obtain palliatives, since the directing of attention to these palliatives must inevitably divert attention away from the end at which we aim. Socialism is therefore opposed, not only to both capitalist parties, but also to the humbug of the present Labour Party—the existence of a Parliamentary Labour Party without a Socialist programme and a Socialist proletariat being more or less a farce. Furthermore, seeing that Trade-Unionism tends to perpetuate the present system, and by its standing for a minimum wage, tends to play into the hands of the Capitalistic Class who need but reply by increasing the cost of the necessities of existence, Socialism must attack and denounce it as being ineffective, and tending to create an aristocracy of labour, since the unskilled do not and cannot benefit by its workings, so long as Capitalism endures. I stand therefore, for anti-revisionism, anti-palliationalism, and clear and straightforward revolutionary Socialist propaganda; and am opposed to voting for either Liberal or Tory party under any circumstances. I am also opposed to the placarding of any district with bills, by a Socialist candidate for either municipal or Parliamentary office that would lead other than class-conscious electors to vote for such a candidate. I also feel that many members of the S.D.F. do not understand economics. These facts notwithstanding, I have withdrawn my resignation, since I feel that to leave under present circumstances would be of no service to the cause. Among S.D.F.ers it would be thought that I had been "huffed" into resigning over the religious question, whilst it seems to me that the S.P.G.B. comrades would be doubtful about my sincerity. I also find that whilst the rank and file of the S.D.F. includes many tame and tame revisionists, it also includes many avowed revolutionaries. I also find that there is nothing in the constitution forbidding one to preach revolutionary, clear-cut Socialism. Rather than be misunderstood, I propose to use the S.D.F. platform for placing before members these revolutionary ideas, and where it brings me in conflict with other members, then, if I am expelled, members and comrades will be in no doubt as to the reason of my expulsion. So far as organised representation is concerned, I will only add that, in my opinion, the S.P.G.B. embodies, in its constitution, the best organised expression of class-conscious Socialism. But under present circumstances, although I gain nothing by so doing, I believe, in order that I may not be misunderstood, it is best for me to at present expound clear-cut and uncompromising "impossibilism" on the S.D.F. platform.

With best wishes, and giving you full permission to publish this correspondence, I remain, fraternally yours,

GUY A. ALDRED.

[Enclosure.]

Twentieth Century Press, Ltd.

37a, Clerkenwell Green.

London, E.C.

Sept. 10th, 1906.

DEAR COMRADE H. Quelch asks me to write round to you to say he cannot publish your letter. Regarding your later note, respecting the article on Egypt, he would be very pleased to have it if you will send it in. Fraternally yours,

A. A. WATTS, Sec.

THE "CLARION" AND THE S.P.G.B.

The *Clarion* poses as an exceedingly fair paper. It will allow the other side a show. It will even appoint an editor from the other side to supervise the contributions of champions of that side. This is very fair play. It is magnanimity. It removes all suspicion of partial editing by an opponent of the other side. It encouraged me to write to the *Clarion*.

I did not ask for a special editor. I asked for a hearing. I trusted the *Clarion* to give me that—the *Clarion* being an exceedingly fair paper.

It arose in this way. The *Clarion's* vanmer, Bramley, had reported on his work at Tottenham, and had referred to the local S.P.G.B. as particularly vigorous. This did not appear to suit the humour of the Tottenham I.L.P. In the next issue a Mr. Pedley, of the Tottenham I.L.P., wrote disparagingly of the local S.P.G.B. Therefore I asked the Editor of the *Clarion* to allow me a word.

The Editor had been complaining that some Socialists didn't preach Socialism; that they wasted time on things that didn't matter; that they were not using their opportunities to dispel working-class ignorance. I thought the Editor would be glad to know of a party that preached Socialism only, that never wasted its time on things that didn't matter; that used all its opportunities to dispel working-class ignorance.

Besides, the Party had been attacked by a Tottenham I.L.P. That alone, I thought, would have given me a claim to a hearing in the *Clarion* being a fair paper. So I wrote. The Editor replied, "Sorry, no room."

Now if the Editor wanted to dispel working-class ignorance through the *Clarion*, and wanted to keep out as much as possible of that matter which would not dispel working-class ignorance, but rather increase it, the reply "no room" was not true. There was plenty of room, and it was filled with what the Editor himself would be obliged to confess was piffle from the point of view of one endeavouring to dispel working-class ignorance. From that point of view, I submit, my letter was of far more importance.

Why then was the letter not published? I hope I am not unfair, but I can only conclude that the *Clarion* is more concerned with increasing its circulation than with increasing enlightenment. Its fairness is, therefore, only extended to those who can help sell the paper. Its magnanimity is for those who, in addition to helping sell the paper, haven't got a case—those whose arguments the *Clarion* Editor boasts he can "smash like an egg." All the evidence points that way, anyhow.

The S.P.G.B. is a small party. It wouldn't sell many *Clarions* even if its spokesman did get a show. The I.L.P. is a large party. It can sell a lot of *Clarions*. Therefore the I.L.P. must have a hearing.

Of course, the *Clarion* can do what it likes in such cases. Its staff have got to live. And they must sell *Clarions* therefore. But I hope the *Clarion* will not again parade its fairness.

My letter was headed:

SOCIALISM AT TOTTENHAM,
and read as follows:

Sir, Mr. Pedley, of the Tottenham I.L.P., has written to correct Vanmer Bramley. I write to correct Mr. Pedley. The bone of contention is the S.P.G.B. I am a member of that party and know that in his references to us he is wrong. Perhaps he won't believe it but he is.

The S.P.G.B. does not exist to blackguard Mr. Pedley's leading men. It exists to do precisely what Mr. Pedley says he desires it should do. It devotes itself entirely to preaching Socialism.

In your last issue Robert Blatchford writes: "Some years of more or less strenuous or casual thinking and observation have convinced me the great enemy is ignorance."

That is our conclusion also. The question we have to consider is how best we may combat ignorance.

Mr. Pedley's belief is that the I.L.P. is doing the work best. I conclude so from the fact that he belongs to it.

The S.D.F. member holds his organisation to be the best.

We think that both S.D.F. and I.L.P. are confusing elements whose work contributes to that working-class ignorance which we all profess to desire dispelled. Therefore we exist as a separate organisation.

Which of the parties mentioned is justified? We are all concerned with the realisation of Socialism. We all agree that Socialism is the only way for the workers. We all want Socialism as quickly as possible.

Therefore the question of the best method of dispelling working-class ignorance as the necessary preliminary to the realisation of Socialism is the question for first consideration.

We are prepared to vindicate our position as against S.D.F. or I.L.P. in public discussion before the working class we seek to enlighten. If I.L.P. or S.D.F. can show us we are wrong we are quite ready to vacate our platform and go over.

I know of no better way of proving our sincerity. Does Mr. Pedley?

Let me in a few words outline the position. We want to dispel working-class ignorance. We want the working class to understand why Socialism is the only remedy for poverty and insecurity and misery. Therefore we prove the unalterable antagonism of interest between working class and capitalist class under present conditions and the futility of anything short of Socialism to materially affect working-class unhappiness.

If we prove to the working class the conflict of interest between them and the capitalist class, we make clear the uselessness of the appeal to capitalist representatives which so many professing Socialists encourage.

If we prove the futility of anything short of Socialism to affect the workers as a class, we prevent waste of working-class energy upon palliative programmes. We prevent the inevitable disappointment that comes when palliatives realised, the position of the working class remains the same. We prevent the apathy bred of that disappointment.

We hold, therefore, that the duty of a Socialist party is to preach Socialism only. We hold that the only justification for the existence of a Socialist party is in its propaganda of the insufficiency of anything less than Socialism. We hold that it exists because the reform parties which preceded it, and which still exist, are not good enough.

And because Socialism only is sufficient we hold that any professing Socialist who enlists working-class energies in useless and wasteful and disappointing palliative movements, not only vacates his Socialist position, but is, unconsciously perhaps, working harm to the working class. The workers of harm to the working class are working-class enemies.

We hold and prove the S.D.F. and I.L.P. to be such parties. In producing our evidence it is inevitable that we make personal references. Mr. Pedley objects to these personal references because they embody adverse criticism of his leaders. He wouldn't mind if they were criticisms of the Balfours and Chamberlains. Why? Because the B's and C's are working-class enemies. But we hold that the men who ostensibly engaged in the interests of the working class, confuse working-class thought by association with capitalist representatives in movements for the realisation of objects that don't matter, are greater working-class enemies than the B's and C's.

The S.D.F. and I.L.P. agree as to this when the individual on the rack is a man like Burns. Yet their own leaders are doing precisely the same thing and doing it, moreover, with the sanction and approval of the members of their organisations. The arrangement between Liberalism and the I.L.P. at Leicester which resulted in Ramsay MacDonald's return and Ramsay MacDonald's association with Brunner in the House is one case in point. The support of Masterman Liberal by Hunter Watts S.D.F., of Percy Alden Liberal by Will Thorne S.D.F., the relegation of Socialism to a secondary or even lower position or its obliteration altogether, by I.L.P. candidates, are others. Any number of further instances are set out in our Manifesto.

For taking a consistent line, for making our actions square with our propaganda, we are, if you please, dubbed by Mr. Pedley's Gilbert.

ian leaders "impossibilists," placed without the pale!

I suggest it would be better for our objectors to listen to our "vigorous" speakers at Tottenham and elsewhere. It would be fairer to read our literature and discuss debatable points with us. So, we may arrive at the truth, which I am quite sure will discover us to Mr. Pedley and his friends as not quite the "impossibilists" he seems to imagine we are. And it may be that he will find that, so far from our refusing to do "practical" work (a blessed word that "practical" we are, in preaching Socialism only, which is quite as easy of understanding to the working class as the dubious benefits of the Second Ballot, Payment of Members, and the rest of the pottering futilities beloved of the one-step-at-a-time-and-the-smaller-the-better "Socialists," doing the only thing we can do, the only thing that matters, the only thing that can produce satisfactory results.

If Mr. Pedley can suggest anything more "practical" from a Socialist's point of view, he can let our "vigorous" Tottenham comrades know. They will be glad to hear from him.

And finally, it is not a great point but as Mr. Pedley has inferentially introduced it, it may as well be referred to— if the membership of the Tottenham S.D.F. is lumped together with the Tottenham L.L.P., the result would still require multiplication before it would approximate to the strength of the Tottenham S.P.G.B. We are a small organisation, but unfortunately for Mr. Pedley's irony, we happen to be strong at Tottenham. Yours etc.,

A.J.M.G.

SOME PUBLICATIONS.

Messrs. Watts inform us they are publishing as a sixpenny reprint Hume's "Human Understanding" and "Principles of Morals." Also in the R.P.A. Extra Series Mr. Chilperic Edwards's version of the Hammurabi Code under the title of "The Oldest Laws in the World." Another sixpenny deals with "Socialism: its Fallacies and Dangers," and is contributed to by some of the ablest writers in the Individualist Movement. We do not know who these "ablest writers" will turn out to be, but we are sure their views of the "Fallacies and Dangers" of Socialism will be interesting. These latter seem to comprise one of the principal dishes in the literary menu of those who, we suppose, would fain secure recognition as able—if not the ablest—writers in the individualist movement, but we confess that the result of the effort to combat the arguments which the exponents of Socialism have at command have not perturbed us hitherto. We trust that they will not serve us up a rehash of the ancient mixture with which we are so familiar. Enough is as good as a feast.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary or from the Head Office of the Party, 28, Cursitor Street, E.C.

VOL. II

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

(Sept., 1905 to Aug., 1906.)

Well bound in cloth, gold lettered,

Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be addressed S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

Branch Secretaries and others
SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers.

Printed by Jacomb Bros., T.U., 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.

From Handicraft to Capitalism,

Translated from the German of
KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE ... 1d.

S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE: 28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilington Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.

EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Secretary, 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Sundays at 3.30.

FULHAM.—J. HUMPHRIES, Secretary, 309, North End Road.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fridays, 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Secretary.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30 p.m.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. All invited.

TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road, Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Gorrings Dining Rooms, Gorrings Park Parade, Tooting Junction.

TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets Mondays 8 p.m., at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road, E. Stevens, Sec., 88, Chester Rd., West Green.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd., Watford. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Pl. Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday at 3.30 p.m.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following

BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.

BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.

BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.

LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.

MANCHESTER.—J. S. Maxwell, 84, Dorset St., Hulme.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Laura Rogers, 2, Cromwell Road, Prittlewell.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) ... 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES (Thorold Rogers) ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) ... 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD Vol. I. (Bound) 3s. 0d.

Vol. II. ... 3s. 0d.

Unbound Copies 1 to 12 ... 1s. 0d.

Do. do. 13 to 24 ... 1s. 0d.

MANIFESTO and RULES of the S.P.G.B. ... 1½d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO ... 2½d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES' BOY ... 1½d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST (Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 7½d.

ALL POST FREE.

TO THE TRADE.

The following are Wholesale Agents for The Socialist Standard and other publications of the S.P.G.B.

HENDERSON, 16, Paternoster Row, E.C.

JOHN HEYWOOD, Ltd., Deansgate, Manchester.

W. H. SMITH & SON, Blackfriars St., Manchester.

The
Official Organ
or
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 28. Vol. 3.]

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1906.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

IS SOCIETY AN ORGANISM?

THE question of Socialist policy is raised in a new manner by Mr. Philpott Wright in a letter which appeared in the last issue of this journal. He, it appears, does not agree that Society is an organism, and even asserts that should Society be found to be an organism in fact, then the policy of the revolutionary Socialist must in consequence be wrong. Now, Mr. Wright's attitude, as I shall endeavour to show, is based on several curious misapprehensions both of the nature of Society and of the essentials of an organism.

In the first place, in order to decide whether Society is an organism or not, it is necessary to know the essential characteristics of an organism, and the following, I think, fairly defines them. To be an organism, Society must grow, that is, combine external material with its own substance; it must also have some degree of involuntary, necessary, interdependence or cohesion between its essential parts or mass; it must possess incipient or advanced differentiation of function between its parts; and, above all, it must possess the quality of life, or change and development due to the influence of its environment and to the reaction of its own expansive energy, in other words, it must possess the faculty of the "adjustment of the internal relations to external relations."

The social organism fulfils all these requirements, and though the highest types of human Society may be indefinite as compared with the human body, yet they are much more definite than many low forms of organic life. To enumerate briefly Society's organic attributes, we find that individuals in Society are necessarily and involuntarily interdependent, for shelter, for defence, and for food; indeed, without this organic interdependence, modern aggregations, from the savage pack to civilised society, would be utterly unable to exist in the land they now occupy. We find that differentiation of function, itself mainly involuntary, is represented by the highly complex division of labour which has grown up in the production of the necessities of life. Class division and class rule are, in their inception, also the outcome of this division of labour; in the earlier stages chiefly to provide the necessary stability, order, and military defence, demanded by the continued production of the material necessities of life; in later stages to provide also the political or social order essential to the expansion and development of the prevailing methods of producing wealth. The social organism, we find, also lives and grows, it increases in size and complexity, it adapts itself to the changes in its environment, to the altered conditions resulting from its increasing size and growing needs, and to the influence of other social organisms. Society, then, is undoubtedly an organism.

Mr. Wright, however, makes the astonishing statement that he has "studied the subject for some years" and has "been unable to find an atom of evidence to prove that Society is an organism." He also asks "how can Society be said to even resemble an organism?"

Herbert Spencer's work in this connection is too voluminous to be detailed here, but summaries of his conclusions are reproduced in even elementary handbooks which no genuine student could ignore. Space forbids the quotation of the whole of Professor Hudson's summary of Spencer's parallelisms between individual and social organisms, but for Mr. Wright's benefit I epitomise the main points.

Both societies and individual organisms insensibly augment in mass, and assume during growth a continually increasing complexity of structure. In the early stages of a society as in an undeveloped individual organism, there is scarcely any mutual dependence of parts, and both gradually acquire a mutual dependence that becomes at last so great that the life of each part is made possible only by the life and activity of the rest. In each also, the life and development of the whole organism are independent of, and far more prolonged than, the life and development of any of its component units, who severally are born, grow, reproduce and die, whilst the body politic composed of them survives many generations, increasing in mass, completeness of structure, and functional activity.

Herbert Spencer and others have so firmly established the fact of the organic nature of Society that one is surprised to find it brought into question. Indeed, to deny that Society is an organism is to fall back upon the exploded ideas of the physiocrats, of Locke, and Rousseau, who regarded Society as a voluntary association founded upon a purely imaginary "state of nature."

The misunderstanding of the nature of an organism under which Mr. Wright labours, is made plain when he says: "human society to be an organism must be as complex and contain the same organic parts as its individual members." To take only the type of organism recognised in his letter, the human body, that is entirely composed of cells. It is indeed a colony of cells which have in the course of evolution attained their present functional differentiation. Each individual cell does not reproduce the same complexity, nor does it contain the same organic parts, as the human body in its entirety. Obviously, then, Mr. Wright is wrong. The assumption that the structure of an organism as a whole must be reproduced in its every unit crops out again in his query: "Where in Society can you point and say, there are the brains, there are the lungs, and there is the heart of Society." Apparently he refuses to believe that Society is an organism because he cannot see its feet!

From one unwarranted assumption Mr. Wright is led to another, for he assumes that the necessary episodes in the development of the individual human being must be literally reproduced in the social organism in the form of motherhood, rearing of the "baby society," etc. That the material basis of the new social form must be completely developed or prepared under the old social order itself, was clearly shown in the long quotation from Marx given by T. A. Jackson in a previous controversy. But it is, above all, evident that while all organisms conform to fundamental

evolutionary laws, yet each particular organism has also its own lines of development due to its own peculiar conditions. Hence the development of the social organism will not necessarily proceed on all fours with the development of any individual organism whatsoever. The way Society develops depends upon its own peculiar conditions, internal and external.

In view of these facts the whole of Mr. Wright's argument falls to the ground, for he has assumed that Society, if an organism, must develop in the same way as the human body; when he should instead have studied the peculiar nature of the social organism, and from an examination of its economics and history have traced the laws of development peculiar to it. The question as to whether the reformer or the Socialist is right in his policy does not depend upon Mr. Wright's conception of an organism at all, but upon whether the position of the revolutionary Socialist is, or is not, in accord with the facts of Society's growth and structure. If the Socialist analysis of Society and History is correct, then, whether Society be called an organism or a plum pudding makes not the slightest difference in the result.

Though professedly revolutionary, Mr. Wright informs us (in italics) that "a new society has never been born in the whole recorded history of civilisation." It is a moot point whether that is meant simply as a play upon the word "born," or whether it is intended to convey the absurdity that only one form of political society has ever existed, and that (to adapt Mr. Wright's metaphor) the French Republic, for instance, is but the society of Louis XVI "with its moustache waxed." If he does not mean this, if he means by "society" in this case not solely the political and legal superstructure but the whole social organism, and that no new social organism has arisen during historic times, then he might have saved himself the trouble of writing, for every Socialist knows that in each case the various stages of the ever-changing methods of production, and the political revolutions to which their changes have given rise, and the new forms of exploitation and political societies of which these revolutions have been the starting points, have been episodes in the life history of one and the same social organism.

The inevitable double use of the word "Society" is, perhaps, the cause of confusion, for like many other words it has more than one meaning. In one sense it stands for the social organism in its entirety, in another it means solely the political and judicial superstructure as distinct from the gradually changing economic basis. The distinction may be made clear by a very homely illustration. The social organism may be compared with the common lobster in its outer skeleton or shell, while Society in the political sense may be likened to the shell alone. A useful function is performed by the shell in the life of the lobster, but as the animal grows the shell gradually becomes unsuited to it and impedes its further development. Now the shell, having outlived its usefulness, is shed so that the animal may continue to grow, and the new shell which

is formed is suited to the next stage in the animal's development. This casting of the shell occurs as often as the growth of the lobster requires it, and literally fulfils Mr. Wright's demand for an organism which "kills off its organic parts and still waxes stronger and stronger."

Society in the narrower sense is, then, the political and legal superstructure or shell of the social organism transformed or created by the class whose political control has been necessitated by the conditions of production of the material livelihood. Owing to the continuous development of the methods of wealth production and the changed social relationships thereby caused, the ruling class and the social order they have formed are gradually turned from forms of development of the economic forces into hindrances or fetters. At length economic conditions develop so far under the old society that they are ripe for, and necessitate, the change; then ensues a period of revolution, and the ruling class, having become functionless or worse, must give way to new control and interests in harmony with the new economic conditions and the further development of Society as a whole. This seizure of political power by a hitherto oppressed class is a *revolution* whether accomplished peaceably or the reverse, and sooner or later the whole political and legal superstructure, and the old property relations, undergo a transformation into a social order in harmony with the new paramount interests and conditions. *A new society is born*, and a further stage in the development of the productive forces is rendered possible by the destruction of the old legal and social forms which hindered their expansion and full use.

It being the nature of men and classes to cling to privilege and power until compelled to abandon them, it is evident that the class struggle is engendered by the very nature of the social organism, just as truly as the struggle of the crustacean to free himself from his outgrown shell is imposed by the laws of his organic being. Mr. Wright, therefore, is in error in supposing that the existence of internecine strife negates the social organism. No organism is entirely free from internal strife, but the higher in the scale of organisation and the healthier the organism, the more does strife become subordinate to the welfare of the whole.

In the wonderful social organism of the hive bee, which presents several striking analogies with humanity, we see a state of things very similar to that which Mr. Wright describes as a "monstrosity seen only in nightmares." We see the working bees overworked, emaciated, and dying in hundreds in the struggle for existence. We see the drones, fat and lazy, and fed by the workers. The function of the drones is to fertilise the queen bee, and their numbers and the food they consume are out of proportion to their usefulness. Until their function has been fulfilled, however, the glutinous drones are tolerated; but soon after the queen bee has been fertilised, at a period after the function of the drones has been fulfilled, the working bees drive out or exterminate the drones who have become functionless and unnecessary.

Mr. Wright attaches too much importance to the idea that evolution is solely a continuous and equable process. Herbert Spencer has, in his "Law of the Rhythm of Motion," demonstrated the universal ebb and flow of life, and Professor De Vries, at Hamburg, pointed out that "plant and animal species remain for a long time unchanged; some finally disappear, when they have become old and unfit for the conditions of life, which have in the meantime altered. Others are more successful, and, to use his very expression, 'explode' and give life to numerous new forms, of which some assert themselves and multiply, and others, which are unfit for the conditions of life, disappear." Again, Professor Darwin, in his Presidential address to the British Association last year, stated that, "the physicist like the biologist and the historian, watched the effect of slowly varying external conditions, he saw the quality of persistence or stability gradually decaying until it vanished, when there ensued what was in politics called a revolution." He added that in biology they should "expect to find slight continuous changes occurring during a long period of time, followed by a some-

what sudden transformation into a new species, or by rapid extinction."

The phenomenon of metamorphosis, the many examples of sudden change of function which abound in nature, together with the opinion of many scientists, all show that revolution is part and parcel of the evolutionary process. But it should be borne in mind that in the natural sciences as well as in sociology, the period of more than usually rapid change that is called revolution, is in general primarily a change of function rather than a change of structure. Kautsky's illustration of the birth of a child is intended to make that clear. This fact, together with the necessity for the revolutionary method in working-class politics, may be shown by an illustration drawn from Society itself.

The huge and complex machinery and methods of production which constitute a great trust can only be the outcome of a prolonged evolution or growth, but the huge trust itself may most easily be made to minister to the well-being of those who were formerly exploited by it, by it being taken over by the people at one blow. The idea of the trust being socialised piecemeal and gradually, item by item, is preposterous. With the socialisation of the trust, then, there occurs only a slight change in structure—but an entire change of function. But that is not all. Before this can occur, in order that the taking over by Society of the trust may really change its function from a means of profit to the capitalist into a means of well-being to the workers, it is necessary that Society be identified, not with the exploiters, but with wealth producers. Hence the necessity for the social revolution before all things, for only when the political power has been wrested from the now useless capitalist class can the political machinery and the economic forces developed under capitalism be transformed in function from instruments of exploitation and oppression into the means of life and happiness of a people.

I would like to have gone further, and to have shown how the nature and fuller development of the vast associated methods of production of to-day necessitate social organisation and democratic control, and how the great power of social production must render the existence of any functional governing class henceforth unnecessary by the liberation of the mass of mankind from the greater part of the toil of production; and how also the social organism with the attainment of Socialism approaches that stage of unity and organised directive intelligence and power which may fairly be called the attainment of social consciousness. But, like Mr. Wright, I am constrained to apologise for the length of my epistle, which already has far exceeded the modest limits I had at first assigned to it. Sufficient has, I think, been said to show at all events, that Mr. Wright's objections to the reality of the organic nature of Society do not hold, being based on mistaken ideas of the essentials of an organism and of the nature of Society.

F. C. WATTS.

IMPORTED NONSENSE.

The sapient gentleman whom the *Daily News* is pleased to claim as its own special correspondent in Paris, in referring to the appointments of Viviani and Briand to the Clemenceau Cabinet says: "The Socialist ideal is, of course, the substitution of 'collective' exploitation for 'capitalistic' exploitation. The *Daily News* gentleman had better try again. 'The Socialist ideal is of course'—nothing of the kind. It is the substitution of collective ownership and control for capitalistic ownership and control with the consequent extinction of exploitation altogether. The *Daily News* gent has been studying the work of these Socialists who unfortunately afflict the movement in France as in England. He has correctly stated their ideal. They are for State capitalism or collective exploitation. We are not concerned with State capitalism. We are concerned with Socialism. Socialism is the negation of capitalism. Consequently State capitalism cannot be the ideal of any Socialist. Ergo those who preach State capitalism or collective exploitation are not Socialists. The *Daily News* gent has been studying in the wrong school.

HOIST WITH HIS OWN PETARD.

"The concessions, such as they are, which have been made have been much less due to our agitation than to the pressure of circumstances."

Would the agitation have been carried on, would there have been any need for either agitation or concessions, if normal agencies—private charity and so on—had effectually grappled with the unemployed difficulty, and unemployment had not, in spite of these agencies, grown and developed into a chronic social disorder? Again with free education. Neither the first compulsory Education Act of 1870 nor the abolition of fees in elementary schools was the work of people who believed in the justice of either measure as an abstract principle; and neither would have been adopted except that in no other way was it possible to remove that ignorance of even the bare elements of education which had come to be a national danger.

The same too with old age pensions and municipal trading. The trade unions are now, with practical unanimity, demanding old age pensions, and many of the great friendly societies are joining in the demand. Why? Partly, let us modestly admit because of our agitation; but mainly because of the impossibility of securing decent maintenance for old and incapacitated toilers in any other way. Why, in spite of the avowed hostility of the people in power to the principle of municipal ownership and municipal trading, have municipal ownership and municipal trading grown? Partly, we may once more admit as a result of the persistent and active propaganda of our energetic minority, but very much more as a result of the utter failure of private enterprise.

The latest case in point is the report of the Select Committee on the Bill for Providing Meals for School Children. That is a poor half-hearted report on a poor half-hearted measure; but it does at least recognise the need for giving hungry children one meal a day. That is something; a concession made in the hope of winning over the Socialists, says Sir George Livesey. Partly perhaps. But the chief factor in bringing about this concession lies not in Socialist agitation, but in the circumstances that private enterprise has not been able, in this land of plenty, to prevent the horror and disgrace of the starvation of little children."

H. QUELCH.

And that is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance. We reproduce it, despite its length because it may stand as a strong justification of our attitude in relation to reform agitation. We urge the danger and the stupidity of hitching working-class energies on to palliative propaganda. We emphasise the futility of anything less than Socialism and the necessity therefore for concentration upon Socialism alone knowing quite well that all other things will be added unto us either under stress of economic pressure, or because a growing working-class determination to be satisfied with nothing short of the whole product of their labour has struck fear for their safety deep into the hearts of the capitalist class and impelled them to offer anything, everything but their power to rob, in an endeavour to turn the workers from their purpose. And we are sneered at therefore and are, if you please, "impossibilists" on the word of Mr. Quelch himself and the Party he partly leads! Mr. Quelch's party has practically abandoned the revolutionary position of which we claim to be exponents, and become, largely under the direction of Mr. Quelch himself, a mere reform organisation. Yet Mr. Quelch and his friends continue to utter (on special occasions) the sentiments of revolution as though they had not strayed one hair's breadth from the straight but narrow way and continue to pose (when it is good business to do so) as the stern relentless champions of the uncompromising policy. Mr. Quelch has framed a strong indictment of his own party's methods—not to mention his own and as such we commend the article to the attention of our readers.

A LOOK ROUND.

At the National Anti-sweating Conference held recently at the Guildhall, and opened by the Lord Mayor, Mr. Stephen Walsh, M.P., declared that, despite their powerful organisation, the Lancashire miners are in a worse condition to-day than they were in eighteen years ago!

During the Conference Mr. D. J. Shackleton, M.P., vigorously defended child labour, and appealed to the delegates to let Socialism alone and concentrate their energies upon "something practical."

Mr. Shackleton is vice-chairman of the Labour Party in the House of Commons, lately called the L.R.C. Under its auspices various members of the S.D.F. and I.L.P. have run as "Labour" candidates, in order to get the financial support of affiliated trade unionists.

The Workmen's National Housing Council, judging by its Seventh Annual Report, seems to be in a jubilant mood. There are affiliated sixty trade unions, without counting branches, forty-three trades councils, with a few other bodies. During the general election it issued a simple test question to all candidates and received a very large harvest of replies, many of them being very encouraging. Still more encouraging, we are told, is the fact that after persistent attention from the Council lavished on those members who promised to get financial aid for housing from the Imperial Exchequer, and the constant stirring up of ministers, the Government are now committed to the principle, and promise for rural England, Scotland, and Wales, something similar to the Irish Labourers' Bill—cheap money and plenty of it—4½ millions at 3½ per cent. for inclusive money charges. This will be of great assistance when it is fulfilled, and the Council are on the point of asking far the moral support of every affiliated body to keep the Government up to the scratch next session! That's progress!

It will take something more than "moral pressure" to induce the capitalist class to do the only thing that will benefit the working class, viz., get off the workers' backs.

The "test questions for candidates" is a favorite game of the reform politicians. Obviously if any body of men submit certain questions to candidates they must support the candidates who reply favorably and oppose those who do not. Thus we have the S.D.F. and I.L.P., through their affiliation to the National Workmen's Housing Council, supporting capitalist candidates, whilst "in another place" declaring those candidates to be working class enemies.

The S.P.G.B. is out for the abolition of the capitalist system, not its patching up. It therefore wastes no time on so-called reforms, but aims straight for revolution.

In dealing with a complaint that tramway men often found their day of ten hours was spread over fifteen, Captain Hemphill at the L.C.C. said the facts were not as stated, but that the question was receiving the very careful attention of the Committee, who hoped to bring up a report at an early date. This really means, reading between the lines, that the "ten hours' day" for tramway employees is another Progressive lie.

Captain Hemphill also said that the Council had recently spent a sum of £1,500 a year more than had been spent by the old companies, with a view of reducing inconvenience to the men.

Improvements in the means of transit tend to increase the ratio of exploitation of the workers, whether employed by the private trust or the public monopoly form of capitalism. Drivers and conductors of modern electric trams are subject to a very much greater mental and physical strain than were those of the old horse

cars, but their wages are practically the same, and even when higher, the increase is in no sense proportionate to their extra wear and tear. The same applies to motor bus and railway workers.

Mr. R. Bell, M.P., emphasised this in his Annual Report to the recently held Congress at Cardiff. During 1905, he said, the goods train mileage decreased by 400,000 miles in spite of an increase of 11,300,000 tons in goods carried. To have carried the goods traffic of 1905 under the conditions of 1900 would have required over 2,500 more engines and sets of men. Calculating four men to each engine—driver, fireman, cleaner, and guard—this would have meant an increased staff of at least 10,000 men in the running department alone. Instead of this he calculates that this increase in the volume of traffic has been conveyed with some 1,200 less engines and sets of men, for, as different railway chairmen have stated at half-yearly meetings, they have been enabled to take many of their older locomotives out of traffic, and the full number shown to be owned by the companies were not actually working. Thus the mental and physical responsibilities of the men generally have been vastly increased, and the firemen particularly, who have to shovel nearly double the quantity of coal on the large engines without any extra pay at all.

There was another paragraph in the Report which should be interesting to readers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. It relates to the men employed on the North Eastern Railway, and reads as follows:

"This movement on behalf of all grades was sanctioned by the Executive Committee in September, 1903, and the programme adopted by the men at a conference held at Darlington was duly forwarded to the company. Not much progress was made, however, until 1905, when as a result of interviews in March and July a few concessions were obtained for men working large engines and with heavy trains, together with an increased bonus for the East Coast men."

The programme was still pressed, but further delay arose in consequence of changes in the chairmanship and managership. In April and May, however, the committee of the movement and myself had a ten days' conference with the general manager and chief officials, and also another day's discussion with the general superintendent. The programme was fully discussed, in addition to a large number of grievances, resulting in substantial concessions being obtained for the men. The men's delegate meeting, however, would not take the responsibility of accepting the terms offered, and decided to refer the matter to the branches concerned. The Executive Committee, therefore, requested the branches to arrange special meetings at which the North Eastern members should vote for or against accepting the terms. The result showed a majority of 802 against the terms, but as only a very small proportion of the men had voted the Executive Committee decided to accept the terms for the men, and to suggest to the company that a conciliation board be formed. The company have this proposal under consideration at the present time."

The italics are ours.

In the November issue of the "Journemen Bakers' Magazine" Mr. L. A. Hill returns to the subject of the Union's 48 Hours Bill, which was dealt with in our October number. He said it was most essential that this Bill should be passed into law. Machinery had displaced and would continue to displace large numbers of men. Whereas there would be before the introduction of machinery work for five men, there was now only work for three. If the Bill was passed he estimated that it would find employment for some 5,000 men, and that it would be in a measure, a way of solving the unemployed question in the baking trade.

As we pointed out in October, the effect of a compulsory 8 hours' day for bakers, however secured, would be to kill the small bakers and drive the trade into the machine bakeries, where the 8 hours' day already obtains. It would

thus tend to displace 2 men out of every 5, to use Mr. Hill's figures, and would intensify instead of solving the unemployed question in the baking trade.

The "Daily Express" continues to expose the Fraud of Capitalism. In connection with Mr. Lever's Soap Trust (I beg pardon "economic amalgamation") it said,

"The grocer of to-day is almost as much 'tied' as the publican who is managing a 'tied' house for a firm of brewers."

"He has practically ceased to be a free agent, and is becoming more and more of an automaton who is forced to hand out over the counter the ready weighed articles supplied by great trusts and powerful owners of proprietary articles."

"He has little or no share in the selection of the articles he is to sell, and can control neither the price he pays for them nor the price to the customer. He does not even have a chance to see the quality of the goods he sells or to weigh them. Certain sealed packets come to him and automatically he hands them over the counter. "Acting on the instructions of one or other of the great firms who have selected him to sell their goods, he has occasionally to say that a certain article is 'just as good' as a different one desired by a customer, and to see that a customer does not buy the goods he first wanted."

"Twenty years ago a grocer was able to give his customers all they required, but now certain goods are pushed on him, and he in his turn has to force them on the public."

Coming back to the "Daily Express," this organ of Tariff Reform, which recently declared that the American workers, owing to protection, were exceedingly prosperous, made the following admissions in its issue of November 12, last:

"In spite of the wonderful surface prosperity, America is seething with discontent, and the party of the 'have nots' is a very real danger."

"The power of the trusts and the great business combinations has been growing rapidly. The small business man has been driven into the Bankruptcy Court in ever increasing numbers, and has considered himself lucky if he could secure a place as a salaried employee of the trust which absorbed his business. A generation ago most of the dwellers in American cities owned their own homes or looked forward to owning them. Now they would laugh at the suggestion, and they bitterly resent the prospect of a lifetime as a rent-payer to some millionaire or real estate corporation."

"The working men, in spite of their nominally high wages, are bitterly discontented. Wages are not so high as they seem. The bricklayer who earns 24s. a day cannot depend on more than six months work in the year, as there are periods of two or three months in New York when no building can be done on account of the severe weather. The same rule applies to all the building trades, and to the lake and river transportation trades, and to those employed on the railways fed by the lakes and rivers."

"In spite of all the nominal prosperity, New York has its unemployed problem every winter—not so acute as London's problem, perhaps, but still a very serious problem."

As we have so often pointed out, the working class is poor and the master class is rich all over the world, no matter what fiscal or other conditions obtain.

J. KAY.

CORRESPONDENCE IN BRIEF.

H.C. (Plaistow) asks if A. Hayday, whose name appears on the Concert Program of the S. West Ham Liberal and Radical Club, as President of the Club, is the S.D.F. Councillor. He is. W. Thorne is also a member, but we are not sure about J. Jones.

W.S. (Stratford) asks why leaders of the S.D.F. have been glorifying J. J. Terrett at a complimentary banquet when on the 26th Oct., 1905, H. W. Lee, sent round a recommendation from the Sub E.C. to S.D.F. branches not to invite J. J. Terrett to speak for them, in view of the attacks which he had recently made upon the S.D.F. in West Ham. Perhaps "Joe" could explain.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, correspondence and advertisements submitted for insertion therein should be addressed, —The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C., to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is published on the first Saturday in each month.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7 p.m. The Office is open every Saturday until 4 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

UNITED KINGDOM.		
Twelve Months	...	1s. 6d.
Six Months	...	9d.
AMERICA.		
Twelve Months	...	50 cents.
Six Months	...	25 cents.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.



SATURDAY, DEC. 1, 1906.

Our First Municipal Fight.

In another column we publish the results of our first municipal fight and exceedingly gratifying they are when the circumstances under which the contests were conducted are taken into fair consideration. This is not our view solely. Men intimately familiar with local conditions have expressed astonishment at our polls. As one of them put it, "In view of the fact that your only election literature was a manifesto which would only appeal to a deep-thinking man such as the average elector is not, and seeing that the speakers on your platforms did their level best to prevent anybody except those who were prepared to swallow your manifesto holus bolus from voting for your men, it is quite astonishing that you succeeded in recording the vote you did. It was at least twice as high as I, at any rate, expected." That statement, we think, expresses the bare truth. Our only programme was the manifesto which appeared in these columns two months ago. We endeavoured to see that every member of the working class in the wards contested had a copy of that. We issued no other literature. We neither deluded nor attempted to delude anybody with promises. We buoyed them up with no false hopes. We asked only for votes from those who were prepared to endorse the position set out in our manifesto in its entirety. We did all that was humanly possible to prevent any but the class-conscious recording their votes for us. No other party putting forward candidates in London can say as much or nearly as much. To them, therefore, every x they have garnered is indeed an unknown quantity. But we can say with truth that there is very little of the unknown quantity about our votes, they were votes for principles—class-conscious votes, and we congratulate most heartily our comrades in Battersea and Tooting upon the good results they can show of the propaganda work they have performed in their districts. Better to-day than ever are 50 votes for principle than 500 or 5,000 votes for prejudice or personality.

Joy Unspeakable!

And so the Trades Dispute Bill has passed the faithful Commons and has every prospect of getting through the Lords unimpaired. And there is merry-making in the camp of Progress. The independent existence of the "Labour" Group is justified—the bill could never have passed had the Government not been whipped from the outside. The existence of the Liberal

Labour Group is justified—the bill would have never had a chance if they had not been within the councils of the Government to inspire them. The Liberal Government is justified—the bill would never have been introduced at all if it had not been for the well known sympathies of Liberalism with the aspirations—the genuine aspirations—of Labourism. The Tory Party is justified with astonishing magnanimity they withdrew their opposition at the last moment and their leader endorsed the bill with a blessing. Everybody satisfied. Everybody happy. And the lion is at rest beside the lamb.

Suspicious Unanimity.

Which, when one comes to think of it, is rather suspicious. Why this unanimity? Why is it that Capital is giving Labour what Labour is asking for and that almost without a murmur? The question permits of two answers. (1) Capital's hands have been forced and it is therefore making what virtue it can of a necessity. (2) The bill isn't material and doesn't affect capitalist interests. The "Labour" Party, of course, accept the first view and they have some ground for their belief. But while not concerned to deny that for their own purposes the capitalist Liberal Party have preferred to accept with good grace rather than oppose the measure forced upon them (and in so doing have attached to themselves some sympathy and votes which would probably have been diverted from them had they refused to deal with the matter), this at any rate is beyond question—the bill does not hit their interests hard; it is not material. Had it been otherwise; had there been any vital matter at stake, not all the "Labour" Party horses nor all the "Labour" Party men—what there is of them—could have compelled them to capitulate as they have done in the case under notice without a struggle and probably a bloody struggle at that.

A Great Victory—Investigated.

What, after all, does the great victory amount to? It amounts in effect to practically no more than a reversion to the condition that Labour Unionism thought it was in up to the Farwell decision. It is a case of as you were—no more than that. Indeed, it is a famous victory. The working class can now, if they like, strike. They can peacefully persuade others to join with them. And the funds of the Union are not liable for unauthorised acts of Union members. But the strike is a feeble weapon and in the hands of class-unconscious workers, as most of those who use it are, absolutely useless except on very rare occasions. In a strike the capitalist class, because they own the means of living and control the wealth, can sit tight and smile. The striking workman consumes almost immediately what few resources he has and, with starvation glaring at him, submits or goes under. Well, the bill permits him to keep on doing that; it permits the capitalist class to keep on starving the worker out. It simply doesn't touch the economic interest of the exploiter and only in the remotest and infinitesimal way benefits the exploited. But it is a famous victory. Hooray!

Trusts and Soap.

It was the Liberal *Star*, mouthpiece of that great progressive, democratic, Liberal and Labour combination of which Mr. Lever is so distinguished a member, that tooted its horn gleefully because it was of opinion that Mr. Lever's soap combine was undone—smashed by a great wave of popular and righteous Liberal-Labour indignation forcefully and fearlessly expressed out of a knowledge of the rascally rapacity of the capitalists who dominated the Trusts which are so emphatic a feature of American commercialism. The yankee Trust has had a most unhappy time of it, thinks the *Star*, in endeavouring to fix its tentacles upon British industry. The hard-headed practicality of sober-minded Englishmen is a guarantee of the invincibility of free and unfettered English commerce against the threatening advance of the monopolist market-riggers across the herring pond, even if it were not the fact (which of course it is) that the anti-protectionist policy of the great Liberal-Labour combination aforesaid was in itself a

sufficiently insurmountable barrier. Trusts as is well known (in Liberal-Labour circles), are only the accompaniment—the necessary and inevitable accompaniment of production within a tariff ring.

The True Blue Variety.

Instead of which the English Sewing Cotton Trust has just absorbed the few sewing cotton manufacturers who until now have maintained a precarious and financially disastrous existence in competition with the trust which has been able, owing to its command of capital and its control of more highly organised and economical methods of production and distribution which command of practically unlimited capital gives, to show profits on its working of about three million pounds sterling per annum.

Then the tobacco manufacturers after a short, sharp fight with the American trust, found that their only way of escape was by combination, and as a result we have the Imperial Tobacco Co., a true blue British trust operating, not in opposition to its American *fac simile*, but hand-in-hand with it to control the British and American markets and avoid the waste of competition. Then we have the Wall Paper Trust, a most eminently respectable hall-marked product of merry England. The Railway Companies also, although not yet in the trust stage, are recognising the value of combination and are avoiding unnecessary expenditure over certain competitive routes by pooling receipts and so on.

The Evolution of Capitalist Combination.

It would almost seem that the *Star's* chortle is only possible because of the *Star's* stupidity. The *Star* has been so taken up with its efforts to scintillate that it has forgotten that it is not a celestial body far removed from mundane affairs but quite an earthly sort of a product, whose coruscations depend for success upon the measure of their power to reflect facts. And the facts are that unrestricted competition engenders waste which can only be avoided by combination. Competition goes on until the dwindling margin of profit warns the competitors that they are approaching an abyss. And the smaller the capital at their command the more rapid their approach to the abyss is. They perceive that the competitors who are offering best resistance to the profit-ebbing tide are those whose larger capitals have enabled them to improve their machinery and perfect their methods so that for them production is cheaper. They have the advantage in competition. Then the smaller capitalist comes to himself and offers the bit of the market he can influence, to his larger competitor. He is swallowed up in a combination or if he is stubborn and stupid he is crushed out. The combination grows snowball wise until out of the tussle of interests emerges victoriously in free trade England or protectionist America—the trust.

Inevitable and Necessary.

The trust form of industry, therefore, is the outcome and the necessary product of the competitive form. It is the highest expression of capitalist production. It has eliminated waste. It produces economically in the least time and with a minimum of effort. It is the perfection of production. But it has in its growth developed something else. It has eliminated the capitalist director—the man who under the old competitive system performed some service at any rate in organising and supervising. He is now, perhaps, hundreds of miles from the seat of commerce; perhaps never sees the mill or the factory and is only concerned in them on dividend days. The direction and organisation of the business has passed into the hands of a managerial staff—wage servants all. That is to say the whole process as such is now out of the control of the capitalist class and in the hands of the working or wage-earning class. They produce all wealth but as they do not own the machinery by which that wealth is produced, they do not own the wealth itself. Herein is an anomaly that cannot stand for long. Distribution is out of harmony with production. It cannot remain so. Directly the workers who produce recognise

MUNICIPAL ELECTION NOTES.

The S.P.G.B. ran 12 candidates, 9 in Battersea and 3 in Wandsworth.

The Battersea results were, Latchmere Ward: Craske 117, Moody 117, Money 113; Winstanley Ward: Blewitt 57, Roe 49, Witcher 45; Church Ward: Greenham 93, Fawcett 88, Hunt 77.

The Wandsworth poll (Tooting Ward) was, Barker 94, MacManus 77, Dumenil 59. Of these 50 were plumpers, voting solidly for our candidates alone.

All the candidates fought on the Election Manifesto of the Party published in our October issue, a few of which were distributed in each ward. They had no program of ear-tickling, side-tracking, vote-catching "palliatives" and did no canvassing. The candidates were practically unknown and had not climbed into popularity on the backs of the working class, by posing as "leaders" of unemployed deputations, "right to live" councils, and similar confusionist conglomerations.

The defeat of the "Progressive" and Labour candidates in London was undoubtedly due to the fact that the promises they had so profusely made had not been carried out. The unemployed problem is still with us, slums are being created at a faster rate than they are being destroyed, the shopkeeper is being pressed more heavily each day between the trusts and the rising rates, and so the pendulum swung round.

Keir Hardie is reported to have said that he regretted the defeat of the Progressives. Progressives are simply Liberals, and Mr. Hardie regrets their defeat! Why did the I.L.P. help to secure it by running candidates?

The "Progressive and Labour" candidates in Battersea ran under the auspices of the Battersea Trades and Labour Council, which consists of various trade union branches, Liberal associations, Radical clubs, etc. Many of the T.U. branches are also affiliated to the I.L.R.C., and therefore, while working with the Liberals, subscribe with the ostensible object of fighting them.

In 1903, out of the 36 members elected to the Woolwich Council 28 were Labour candidates. This year only 13 Labour candidates secured seats. The Labour Party thus lose their control of the Council. As 72 per cent. of the electors voted it is obvious that the men who voted for the Labour Party at the last election and sent Will Crooks to the House of Commons have now voted for the Moderates. Why? Because they have no guiding principle to work upon and Crooks, Hardie & Co. have been too much concerned about getting in to endeavour to implant it. Hardie says that the Labour Party have lost at Woolwich because of the Arsenal dismissals, but if the Labour Party had not given the electors to understand that these dismissals would cease and the unemployed problem would be solved if only the workers voted "labour" there would have been no disappointment and no reversal of the position. But you cannot ensure the continued confidence of the working class unless you play the game straight. There is no cure for the evils of capitalism except the abolition of capitalism. Tell the people that at all times and under all conditions, and although it may take somewhat longer to gain their confidence and support, you will retain it when you have gained it.

Mr. George Belt, recently the paid organiser of the S.D.F. in Scotland, contested the Starch Green Ward of Hammersmith. He did not run as a Socialist, but under the auspices of the L.R.C. "Labour" was writ large all over his election address. He suppressed his membership of the S.D.F. and described himself as of the "Federated Builders' Labourers." But then, of course, it is one thing to be paid by the S.D.F., and another to be seeking the moral

and financial support of trade unionists. This is a glaring instance of what the Pearson Paralyser called "The Fraud of Socialism," but, as a matter of fact, it was only the Fraud of George Belt.

Our old friend, Free Maintenance, received a very severe twisting at the hands of S.D.F. candidates. Belt made no reference to it. Fulham S.D.F. candidates declared for State Maintenance, as did also those of Battersea, Islington, and parts of West Ham. Rogers and Wilkinson at Southend whittled it down to "The provision of at least one good meal daily to all scholars." The Southwark men favoured free meals to all destitute children attending the public schools, whilst in Camberwell State Maintenance was boldly advocated. In Lewisham, however, it got back to "Free Meals for Necessitous Children." It is quite evident that these people have not made up their minds about their beloved palliatives.

At Northampton the S.D.F. ran 6 candidates, but only one (J. Gribble) was successful. W. Pitts lost his seat. Gribble is their only representative now. Their total poll was 2,912. Last year it was 3,221 in the same wards.

After the poll A. G. Slinn said that the more revolutionary the candidate, the more disagreeable he was to the capitalists, the more likely was success. No man was more hated by the opposition than Gribble, yet he had been elected by a majority that struck terror into the hearts of the capitalists.

This was a little unkind to the other candidates.

Matters were somewhat complicated in Islington. The S.D.F. branches decided to run their candidates "on their own," apart from any other bodies. Two of their members, however, C. Cook and R. E. Jupp, were invited to run under the auspices of the Islington Trades Council, and after consultation with the E.C. of the S.D.F., accepted the invitation. They were expelled by the Islington branches of the S.D.F. and promptly joined another. There will be developments.

These two candidates were not only endorsed by the E.C. of the S.D.F., but were supported by such tried, trusted and true Revolutionists as W. T. Wilson, M.P., C. W. Boverman, M.P., W. Steadman, M.P., A. Henderson, M.P., J. E. Gregory, and others. And still they did not win!

The Stratford S.D.F. ran J. A. Bassett in Park Ward, and J. Andrews in Broadway. Separate and greatly differing election addresses were issued by each. Andrews advocated the provision of free meals as is done in Paris, and Bassett was in favour of Free Meals, and, when necessary, of Free Clothing.

In South West Ham Ben Cunningham ran as a Socialist, but the S.D.F. refused to support him. J. Jones, A. Hayday, and other S.D.F. men backed a local official (a non-Socialist) of a powerful and wealthy trade union against him. Explanations, votes of censure, alarms and excursions are in the air!

One of the chief concerns of the I.L.P. candidates in East Ham was the cheaper burial of the dead. Said they, "The making of personal profits out of the dead is certainly anything but ethical. Our dead should be interred as cheaply as possible, and any profits accruing to go to the community." So cheer up! we'll soon be dead! and if only a sufficient number of us die quickly, why, look how the rates could be reduced!

Justice points out that its members in Burnley, who ran under the auspices of the L.R.C. all ran as *armed Socialists*. It is somewhat amusing when a body claiming to be Socialist has to draw attention to the fact that certain of its members ran as "armed Socialists." J.K.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

WHY WE OPPOSE OTHER PARTIES.

Stanley Villa,
92, Duckett-road, Harringay.
16/9/06.

To the Executive Committee, S.P.G.B.

Gentlemen,—I am writing to you, to express my thoughts on a matter that has given me much food for reflection lately, and anxiety moreover that the cause may suffer. I put the question to Comrade Anderson the other night at Harringay, asking whether he "ignored the efforts of any Socialist not connected with the S.P.G.B.," even though they may be successful in making class-conscious converts; also whether he would help, or receive help from, them or not.

His reply was that the S.P.G.B. does not recognise any Socialist not connected with them.

That is pretty definite, but has it never occurred to you that that is a rather dogmatic position? Can it be reconciled? Now before we go any further let us understand one another.

I am a class-conscious Socialist, opposed to the two orthodox parties. I accept your Declaration of Principles as a sound basis of waging the class war. I have been instrumental in my small individual way, more or less of influencing others on those lines. There are hundreds of others also the same as myself.

Leaving out of the question for the present whether they belong to any party or not, the fact remains that the result to be achieved is the awakening of the proletarian mind, to which class they belong.

That being so then, it matters little how a man is converted, or by whom, so long as he understands Socialism, and can be relied upon to vote for a Socialist, and not a Liberal or Tory.

The one who taught him, and who was successful in converting him, may have been a member of any other Socialist organisation, or none at all, or he may have been converted in instalments, by different persons, members of different organisations and various unattached, each one contributing to the sum total of information and conviction.

In the face of possibilities like this, and it is a possibility, is it not absurd to ignore the efforts of anyone not connected with the S.P.G.B.? There are many such, totally ignorant of its very existence. There may be members of Socialist organisations who do not see the wisdom of forsaking their society and joining a new party, formed by their comrades, who, dissatisfied with certain tactics in the existing organisations, decide to do so, and wage war on the very parties under whose auspices they formerly carried on propaganda, and for whom they possibly secured many new members.

Just imagine the ridiculous position of a member of the S.D.F. of four years ago, for example, who is now a member of the S.P.G.B., turning round and denouncing the very members of the S.D.F. who may have been the means of his conversion, and some whom he may have converted, which members, moreover, are using the same arguments as he used, and is using, to convert others now.

What sense would there be in his saying:—"You're no Socialist: you've been converted by the S.D.F., and the S.D.F. is not a Socialist party?" Now, gentlemen, although you may have some reason for your actions and position, you will admit it looks very ridiculous in the eyes of the uninitiated and illiterate mob, such as were congregated around Anderson on the night in question, who, by the bye, were asking some of the most absurd questions, besides belching forth torrents of obscene invective, and giving me the depressing impression that progress seems almost impossible with such awful ignorance prevailing amongst the very class whom we rely upon to help us in the social revolution. And that is the very thing that should be most guarded against. Are not the opponents and the unthinking continually throwing that up in our teeth, that "they are a house divided against itself" and "that is the happy state of affairs that will accrue under Socialism," etc.? Besides, where is this procedure likely to stop? It is just possible that there will be members in

your party, who will not agree with certain actions or tactics decided upon at a Conference—in reference to trade unions, e.g.—and may kick over the traces of the S.P.G.B., and start yet another little band of "determined and vigorous revolutionists," and they in their turn may also have a split, so that in the end there is a conglomeration of infuriated, over anxious sections flying at each other's throats, and making the already existing confusion worse confounded.

I hope you see my point: pray don't think I am going for you or bearing you any animosity. Far from it, I sincerely admire your little party, for the earnestness and pluck that is displayed, sometimes against such disheartening odds. My only object is to reason together for the good of the cause we have at heart. Every Socialist worthy of the name has the sincerest desire to do something for the realisation of his ideas; and if those ideas are Socialistically sound, who, pray, is in the superior intellectual sphere (otherwise than self appointed) to dictate as to whether he can correctly teach others?

But you will say, "Oh, yes, so-and-so is a very good lecturer, but then he only does good from the standpoint of such and such a party." Well, for the life of me I cannot see the reason for hostility on that account. I suppose if he were to deliver the same lectures from an S.P.G.B. platform he would be a fine chap, an able exponent, etc. It would seem that the party is the thing, not Socialism. Is he likely to make more converts on your platform? Indeed, how do you know that he may not have been instrumental in converting some of your very members. In fact every member owes his conversion to an evolution of influence external to his party.

Surely you do not expect to get the whole of the proletariat converted, and members of your party by such means. Even if you maintain that the revolution can only be accomplished by every Socialist joining your ranks you will have to use the arguments of those parties you denounce to convert the "snobbishly" respectable wage slave residents of modern Suburbia forthwith: they cannot be converted by the same tactics or argument used in Lambeth or East Ham for instance.

That is why I for one contend that a united party is neither practical nor desirable at present, when a person is not allowed to think or say what he or she conscientiously believes, but must rigidly adopt a party ticket, they are more likely to remain hostile. But if they can be approached through sentimental channels, their prejudices may be overcome, their sympathy aroused, and finally their enthusiasm gained. Thus a much broader field of propaganda is open at present.

Let each section do their work in their own way: they are all aiming at the same goal, only have different roads of getting there, forsooth, if some are farther round, well, they arrive in the end and pick up some strangers on the way that otherwise might never have come.

I do most grievously deplore the confusion that is caused by this and that party wanting to claim all the intelligence, and warning customers not to deal at the shop next door, so to speak. To everyone that is converted I venture to say there are a dozen embittered or disgusted. And where does the freedom of thought come in? We say we want the workers to think for themselves, and then they are told that they must not think that they can realise their social emancipation by belonging to any but the S.P.G.B. What are they to think of that?

Do let us be reasonable I beseech you, allow every man the right to belong to what party he fancies most; assist everyone who is aiming at the emancipation of humanity from the galling chains of monopoly and capitalism, no matter of what party, religion, race or colour he may be. Then and only then shall we succeed in convincing the world that we stand for freedom, justice, and universal brotherhood.

Apologising for writing at such length and trusting you will see the reasoning of my appeal to you in the name of the cause, and wishing you, one and all, every success, I remain,
Yours fraternally,
FRED. W. TOD.

We welcome criticism. We are therefore glad to have the opportunity of publishing Mr. Tod's

letter. The more so as we think his difficulty is shared by many.

Mr. Tod tells us that he views our Declaration of Principles as a sound basis on which to wage the class struggle. But the whole of his letter is a plea for the abrogation of that portion of the Declaration which declares hostility to every other political party. The S.D.F. is a political party even as the Liberal Party is. The acceptance of our Declaration of Principles, therefore, signifies a refusal to help those "other Socialist parties" in the way Mr. Tod suggests.

We cannot think that Mr. Tod is justified in saying that we should recognise everybody and everything which is making for Socialism. We do not. We fully recognise that every action of every political party, of every person, and of every economic force is making for Socialism. We know that a political party may be what is termed re-actionary, but to-day the re-action reacts in the direction of progress toward Socialism. This is not, however, what Mr. Tod means. His idea is that there are Socialist parties outside the S.P.G.B.; that the aim of those parties is the realisation of Socialism; and that, therefore, those parties should receive the support of the members of the S.P.G.B.

Through the action of the members of those parties people are converted to Socialist views, and any person securing the conversion of people to Socialism should be recognised by the S.P.G.B. So runs the argument. But how are we to recognise them? My conversion to Socialism was mainly the result of reading the works of Mr. Herbert Spencer, and of seeking to apply the principles enunciated therein to the conditions of the working class with whom I lived. Mr. Spencer was a militant opponent of anything trending towards Socialism. How is he to be recognised by the S.P.G.B., and are we to help those of whom he is the type?

But, says Mr. Tod, how absurd you are,—you who have within the last four years been members of the S.D.F.—to attack that body and its members, and amongst them those whom you yourselves have converted. This is entirely fallacious—false premiss, false conclusion. In the first place we do not attack the members of the S.D.F. because they are members of the S.D.F. We simply criticise such political actions of theirs as are inconsistent with membership of a sound Socialist party. We only condemn the S.D.F. in so far as they have departed from a clearly defined, class-conscious, working-class party. We do not criticise those whom we have converted, for, in so far as they are open to our criticism, they have not been converted.

The time, says our correspondent, is not yet ripe for a united Socialist party. So we must live and let live. But why? On the contrary we think the time is ripe for a united Socialist party, but it must accept the Declaration of Principles of the S.P.G.B. There can be no possible justification in any country for the existence of more than one sound, class-conscious, working-class party, and in Great Britain we find that there is but one—the S.P.G.B. We should be pleased to hear of converts being made to Socialism, whatever the cause of conversion. Possibly the S.D.F., the I.L.P., the Fabian Society, the Liberal Party, or the Tory Party may aid in the conversion of men and women to Socialism. So far so good. But when once they are converted they must recognise that the S.P.G.B. is the party which they must join, as this is the only party with a sound Socialist organisation.

"What sense," asks Mr. Tod, "would there be in saying, 'You're no Socialist: you've been converted by the S.D.F., and the S.D.F. is not a Socialist party?' But has this ever been said? What we do say is 'You say you have been converted to Socialism by the S.D.F. The S.D.F. is a body whose 'Socialism' is peculiar. Do you believe that your belonging to a party like the S.D.F., which does not run its candi-

THE "CLARION" ON ITS DEFENCE.

THE *Clarion* has been "hit in the place where it lives" by the protest against its unfairness which was printed in the last issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. At any rate it deserves quite a space to a rather ill-humoured repudiation of the charge, in the course of which it says:

(1) That my letter would have occupied a column and therefore was virtually in the waste paper basket before it arrived.

(2) That my article contained "spiteful abuse" of the *Clarion's* "poor old Editor" who knew nothing of the matter in dispute.

(3) That I stated the *Clarion* was filled with "piffle."

To which I beg leave to make rejoinder as follows:—

(1) My letter was intended to outline and justify the position of the S.P.G.B. which had been criticised in two previous numbers of the *Clarion*. I thought this was a rather important matter. If a Party is contributing to working-class confusion, maintaining working-class ignorance and therefore delaying working-class emancipation, it is, I submit, an important thing from a Socialist point of view, to combat the work of that Party. I thought so, anyhow, and the *Clarion* says it thinks so too—sometimes.

The S.P.G.B. came into existence to combat the confusing effect of the work of professing Socialist organisations and to preach Socialism. The *Clarion*, which says it agrees with the position the S.P.G.B. alone upholds, refuses to print a letter from the S.P.G.B. because it would occupy a column. Mark. The case of the S.P.G.B., whose position the *Clarion* says it agrees with, has never been stated through the *Clarion*. We haven't had a line. All the other Parties which—if our contention is upheld as we say we can uphold it—the *Clarion* is supposed to be against, have pages!

This, however, may not be taken as a sign of a wonderful magnanimity on the part of the *Clarion* toward those with whom it is in disagreement. It agrees with our position all right, but it also agrees with the position of those we are fighting! Rum? Not at all! Just *Clarionese*.

Now accepting this basis, *Clarionese*, it may not unnaturally be expected, I think, that as we are agreed with as much as the other chaps who are opposed to us, we should get as good a show in the *Clarion* as they. They have had pages. We have had the exact equivalent of nothing. We didn't ask for pages. I only asked, it appears, so great was my moderation, for a column, and I only asked for that because we had been dragged into the *Clarion* without our knowledge or consent. I confess I expected to get the space necessary in the circumstances, particularly as it is an infraction of one of the few canons of honour journalism can boast of to print an attack and exclude the reply.

But—dear me! no, says the *Clarion's* Dangle. No code of honour of any newspaper in the world and certainly not the *Clarion's* would stand the strain of any reply of over 250 words unless—ah!—unless your reply will sell *Clarions*. If you are "Tess of the Suffragettes" for example, well,—come and welcome, sinner, come, even though the *Clarion's* editor thinks the women's agitation childish and silly. Or if you are an ecclesiastical dignitary, (Bishops preferred)—come again, even though your arguments are "piffle" in three column efforts capable of being "smashed like an egg" by the *Clarion's* fighting editor. Come one, come all if you can sell *Clarions*. But don't expect to get in against the sellers of *Clarions*. You may be the very embodiment of all the virtues; you may have the message that will set the people free, but if you are obscure and insignificant or if you are useless as a seller of *Clarions*—outside! Perish everything but *Clarions*.

Well, I don't sell *Clarions*. The Party on whose behalf I write don't sell *Clarions*. My letter wouldn't have sold any. Beside, it hit against the men of the Parties that do sell *Clarions*. It might have had a bad effect upon sales. Therefore, and so far as I can see only therefore, I am a "stodge-spinner" and am waste-papered.

All right, I don't mind but—oh! what a fall is here, my countrymen. What a descent from

Olympian profession to Stygian practice. Poor old *Clarion*. Poor old Dangle.

(2) Wherein did my article contain "spiteful abuse" of Blatchford or anybody else? Answer Dangle or withdraw. And please I couldn't help it if Blatchford didn't see or hear of my letter. He is still Editor, isn't he? And Dangle! It occurs to me, speaking of Blatchford, that if he had had the same cause for writing that I had, and particularly if he had had the same case that I have, he would have run his article in weekly 4 column instalments over a period of six months at least, and yes, and then published it in book form! You know he would.

(3) I stated the *Clarion* was filled with "piffle"? I said nothing of the sort. What I did say was that Blatchford would have called columns of what appeared "piffle." If Dangle doesn't believe it he should ask Blatchford himself.

Just another word. My friend Dangle appears to be absorbing some of the methods of the Yellow Editors whom he delights to pillory. He publishes sufficient of my statement to convey a false impression. He inferentially imputes certain beliefs to me which I do not hold, in order that he may have excuse for pouring out the vials of his strongest mixture of caustic and iron upon my head. His references to the flatulency of his correspondents, while doubtless intended to be scathing, are in exceedingly poor taste and if Dangle had been less hasty would probably never have been passed.

In short, my dear Dangle, you have in this matter adopted the methods that are cheap and nasty. And I am astonished!

A.J.M.G.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE ON HIS NETTLE.

AFTER Mr. Bryan, Lord George. Mr. Bryan declares that if his scheme of Free Trade in Trust articles fails, it must mean the growth of a definite Socialist Political Party. Mr. Lloyd George declared at Birmingham on October 22nd, that the period had arrived when the Liberal Party was to be put to the test. He said that "the new movement represented a real upheaval due to the impatience of the people of the slow progress made by existing parties in redressing wrongs." No wonder the people asked "why all this tarrying and dallying?" They said to the old political parties, "If you are in earnest you are bunglers; if you are not in earnest you are rogues." The answer rested with the Liberals during the next three years. The people had said to them, "We are going to give you your chance, but it is only a chance. The whole future of the Liberal Party depended upon the practical answer they gave to the expectations of the people."

So in three years' time if the Liberal Party do not remove the conditions that give rise to the complaint of the people (vide Lloyd George), "Here you have been tinkering for generations with reform, and the end of it all is shams, pauperism, and great want in a land of plenty," the Great Liberal Party will deserve to go. We have no fear but that they will so deserve. The "great want in a land of plenty" is due, as has been proved time and time again in these columns, to the private ownership of the means of living, i.e., capitalism, and nothing short of the abolition of capitalism will abolish that "great want." The Liberal Party represent the capitalist class and we shall watch with interest capitalism proceeding to abolish itself.

After three years' more tinkering the condition of the workers will not have improved, and the efforts of the Liberals, "bunglers or rogues," will have failed. And then Mr. Lloyd George says the new movement will grow and displace the bunglers. As in the case of Mr. Bryan's proposals the alternative has already commenced to develop in anticipation of the failure of the capitalists' suggested remedies for the evils of the system they are so concerned to conserve.

DANGLE.

The Cleveland (Ohio) branch Y.M.C.A. has decided by vote that a millionaire cannot be an honest man. *Punch* says pathetic scenes were witnessed when the news was broken to the millionaires who had been trying their hardest

GOOD WORK in MANCHESTER.

Dear Comrade,

Just a brief record of work done on behalf of the S.P.G.B. in Manchester and district during the past few weeks. On Sunday, September 23rd, H. W. Hobart was lecturing at Salford for the S.D.F. and to him we put one or two questions at the close of his address. Not being satisfied with his replies and at the invitation of the chairman the platform was occupied for 10 minutes and the futility of the reforms advocated by the lecturer was shewn.

The Friday following we came upon the S.W. Manchester S.D.F. holding forth at Russel Street, and a question or two bearing upon the lecturer's statement that the S.D.F. had always stuck to their principles, led to somewhat of a scene, the whole of the usual stock of compliments being literally showered upon us, but at the request of the crowd, the major portion of whom disagreed with this style of dealing with questions—the platform was once again occupied, the futility of reform agitation exposed, and instances given where the S.D.F. had departed from its principles by allowing men of the type of Thorne to support Liberal candidates and to hide their Socialism as Labour candidates, etc. Receiving an invitation to appear next week and to have our statements publicly exposed as untruths, we appeared at the appointed time and produced samples of Will Thorne's election literature, Mr. G. Belt's programme, likewise his leaflet admitting his endeavour to compromise with the Liberal Party etc., etc. After a vain endeavour on the lecturer's part (Mr. A. H. Watson), to quibble and a tardy admission that the organisation may have made mistakes, the chairman stated that he would not at any future meeting take any further questions from us or allow us to oppose. (3 questions were asked and answered and the platform occupied for 10 minutes). A challenge to a public representative debate was likewise ignored. During the remainder of the fine weather meetings have been held on every available evening at various spots, and on two successive Sunday mornings at the corner of Tib St. and Piccadilly we received opposition from S.D.F. speakers. The first was a German member of the S.D.F. whose name I do not remember, the other, J. McGlasson. However, we have not yet stated that we shall not take any more questions or allow opposition, but to one and all we say that we welcome your questions, further, by all means come and discuss with us.

What the average worker cannot see is the reason why the S.D.F. fear debate. To both opponents our words were as follow, "We are prepared to meet in free and open debate, any representative your organisation may choose, whether he be your University educated man or a member of the middle class with all the educational advantages accruing from that position, our organisation will oppose to him a workman, and the workers can decide which organisation is worthy of the support of the working class." Why did McGlasson shake his head so sorrowfully when he publicly received this invitation to his organisation to debate? Did he think of the days gone by when the S.D.F. members boasted that they were prepared to meet all comers? One thing we do know and that is the crowd wanted to enquire for itself and the manifestoes sold well that morning.

Since coming to Manchester we have, up to the time of writing, disposed of over 750 copies of THE STANDARD, 200 copies of the Manifesto, and 52 copies of "Handicraft to Capitalism" and more are on order for

THE REVOLUTIONISTS.

A REUNION

of members and friends will be held at Sydney Hall, 36, York Road, Battersea, on Sunday, December 9th. Tea will be provided at 5.30 for those who have previously advised the branch Secretary, and at 7 a Social and Dance will take place. A Sketch by the S.P.G.B. Mimmers and a Collection in aid of the Party Organ Fund will be features of the evening. All will be cordially welcomed.

Printed by Jacob Bros., 1, 1½, 2a Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

**THE
SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT
BRITAIN****HOLDS**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 2.

**From Handicraft
to Capitalism,**

Translated from the German of
KARL KAUTSKY.

The only translation in the English language of this important section of the famous "Das Erfurter Program."

POST FREE 1½d.

S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is at 28, Cursitor Street, London, E.C.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

28, CURSITOR STREET, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.
CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.
CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmingdon Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m.
EAST HAM.—W. Gifford, Sec., 31, Maryland Square, Stratford. Branch meets Mondays at 7.30 at 447, Katherine Rd., Forest Gate.
EDMONTON.—Sidney Auty, Sec., 60, Gilpin Grove, Edmonton. Branch meets alternate Wed. 8.30.
FULHAM.—J. HUMPHRIES, Secretary, 309, North End Road.
ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Fri. at 8.30 at 79, Grove Rd., Holloway. Communications to the Sec.
PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 90, Mortimer Road, Kensal Rise, W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Harley's Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.
PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Sec., 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Wed. at 8.30.
ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Mondays at 8 at Club.
TOOTING.—P. Dumenil, Secretary, 36, Byton Road Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at Gorrings Dining Rooms, Gorrings Park Parade, Tooting Junction.
TOTTENHAM.—Branch meets Mondays 8 p.m., at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road, E. Stevens, Sec., 88, Chester Rd., West Green.
WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 4, Marlborough Rd. Branch meets alternate Fridays at 8 p.m.
WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Pk. Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at 447, Katherine Road, Forest Gate.
WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 7, Dunloe Avenue, Downhill Park Road, Tottenham, N. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays at 3.30.

INFORMATION

concerning the Party can be obtained of the following
BIRMINGHAM.—H. Oldknow, 227, St. Saviour's Road, Saltley.

BRADFORD (Yorks).—Ben Wilde, 78, Godwin St.

BURTON-ON-TRENT.—J. Blundell, 157, New St.

LIVERPOOL.—J. M. O. Sullivan, 4, Laburnam Grove, Litherland.

MANCHESTER.—J. S. Maxwell, 84, Dorset St., Hulme.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c. to be obtained of the S.P.G.B., 28, Cursitor St., London, E.C.

CAPITAL (Karl Marx) 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND

WAGES (Thorold Rogers) 5s. 6d.

POVERTY (Rowntree) 4s. 6d.

SOCIALIST STANDARD

Vol. I. (Bound) 3s. 6d.

Vol. II. 3s. 6d.

Unbound Copies 1 to 12 1s. 6d.

Do. do. 13 to 24 1s. 6d.

MANIFESTO AND RULES of the

S.P.G.B. 1½d.

FROM HANDICRAFT TO

CAPITALISM (Kautsky) 1½d.

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO 2½d.

WAGE LABOUR & CAPITAL (Marx) 1½d.

JONES' BOY 1½d.

SOCIALISM & THE WORKER (Sorge) 1½d.

HOW I BECAME A SOCIALIST

(Morris) 1½d.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION (Kautsky) 7½d.

ALL POST FREE.

TO THE TRADE.

The following are Wholesale Agents for The Socialist Standard and other publications of the S.P.G.B.

HENDERSON, 16, Paternoster Row, E.C.

JOHN HEYWOOD, Ltd., Deansgate, Manchester.

W. H. SMITH & SON, Blackfriars St., Manchester.

RETAIL AGENTS.

JACQUES, Old Street, E.C.

TUCKWELL, 160, Fonthill Road, Finsbury Park.

VESPERMAN, 251, Gray's Inn Road, W.C.

WREN, 91, Evelina Road, Nunhead, S.E.

ROOK, 9a, Cursitor Street, E.C.

GRANT, Ilford Hill, Ilford.

SIMPSON, 209, Leytonstone Road, Stratford, E.

BREWSTER, 153, Barking Rd., Canning Town.

WARNE, 1a, Queen's Square, Upton Park, E.

MENHINICK, 40, King William St., London B'dge.